AN INTERPRETATION OF

School of Divinity

This book donated
by

Jerry Wright
in honor of
Alene Cowart
2017

C. W. Durden,
Tifton,
Ga.

GALATIANS, ROMANS, PHILIPPIANS, PHILEMON

Carroll
Bible Commentaries

An Interpretation of the English Bible

Galatians, Romans, Philippians, Philemon

BY

B. H. CARROLL, D.D., LL.D.,

President of Southwestern Baptist
Theological Seminary

EDITED BY

J. B. CRANFILL, LL.D.

ST. JOHN'S BAPTIST CHURCH
Hawthorne Lane and Fifth Street

Dover Memorial Library
Gardner-Webb University
P.O. Box 836
Boiling Springs, NC 28017

NEW YORK CHICAGO TORONTO

Fleming H. Revell Company

LONDON AND EDINBURGH

102

Copyright, 1916, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 125 N. Wabash Ave.
Toronto: 25 Richmond St., W.
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 100 Princess Street

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

The present volume carrying the title, "Galatians, Romans, Philippians, Philemon," is the twelfth volume of Carroll's "Interpretation of the English Bible." These have appeared in the following order: "Genesis," "Revelation," "Exodus-Leviticus," "Numbers to Ruth," "The Pastoral Epistles," "Daniel and the Inter-Biblical Period," "The Four Gospels," Volume I, "The Four Gospels," Volume II, "The Acts," "James, Thessalonians, Corinthians," and "The Hebrew Monarchy." There is one other to follow covering the interpretation of the books of Colossians, Ephesians and Hebrews. That will complete "The Interpretation of the English Bible," to be followed later by a biography of the distinguished author.

The present volume is one of the most important of the series. It deals with the deep vitalities of the Christian faith, and while not less interesting to the average reader than its predecessors, it on the other hand dips deeply into what has come to be known as theology. Nowhere in Christian literature is there a more intelligent, discriminating or inspiring discussion of the doctrines of grace, than are to be found in this book. One of the most delightful experiences of my life has been the preparation of the manuscript of this volume, and its proof-reading. In this joy I am sure that Rev. J. W. Crowder, Professor of the English Bible at the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, heartily joins, for it has been his task in connection with all of these volumes, to collaborate with me in arranging and preparing the manuscript.

As an illustration of the depth of the richness of this volume, I venture to make the following quotations from Dr.

Carroll's luminous discussion. Concerning the book of Romans itself, he says:

"It is the most fundamental, vital, logical, profound and systematic discussion of the whole plan of salvation in all the literature of the world. It touches all men; it is universal in its application; it roots not only in man's creation and fall, but also in the timeless purposes and decrees of God before the world was, and fruits in the eternity after this world's purgation."

With reference to man's self-righteousness, so thoroughly discussed by Paul in the book of Romans, Dr. Carroll has these words:

"These good deeds that look so mountainous and multitudinous begin to diminish in size and number and shrink and pulverize until they become like fine dust. One breath of wrath blows them away like powder. On the other side, that little infinitesimal group of evil begins to multiply and magnify and swell and tower and blacken until it is a great mountain range, peak after peak, oozing with the putrid poison of that abominable thing which God hates—SIN."

He discusses another very vital matter—that of final rewards. It has become the rule in our religious literature to say when a good man dies that "He has gone to his reward." This has been written thousands upon thousands of times by men who knew better theologically than their words expressed. No man when he dies goes to his final reward. Dr. Carroll emphasizes this great fact in the following sentences:

"No man is competent to take account of the evil of his deeds or the good of his deeds until he sees the end of their influence. It is impossible for a man to do anything that terminates in himself, but it will surely touch everybody connected with him—father, mother, brother, sister, friend. Not only so, but after it has cast its gloom over all the circle

of those that are nearest to him by ties of consanguinity, there is that awful power of action and reaction that carries it on till the judgment day."

On the great matter of man's personal responsibility to God, the learned author says:

"He will know that his salvation is not of works, but from its incipiency in God's election, to its consummation in the glorification of his body, that athwart the whole long extended golden chain of salvation shall be written in the ineffaceable letters of eternal fire, 'SALVATION IS OF GRACE,' and across the whole dark descending stairway to eternal hell, over every step of it, in letters of fire, 'MAN'S DAMNATION IS OF HIMSELF.'"

In discussing the sinner's attitude toward Christ we have the following:

"It is the hardest thing in the world to convince a sinner that salvation comes from no merit of his, and that faith is simply the hand that receives. Throughout all the length of the great chain of salvation it is presented without discrimination of race, color, sex, or previous condition of servitude."

Concerning the plan of salvation, Dr. Carroll gives us these words, which are surely "like apples of gold in pictures of silver:"

"Christ's one act of righteousness, which is the sole ground of our justification, is His vicarious death on the cross. No one ought to preach at all—having no gospel message—if he does not comprehend this with absolute definiteness. If we attribute our justification to Christ's holiness, or to His preceptive obedience, or to His Sermon on the Mount, or to His miracles, or to His kingly or priestly reign in heaven, where He is now, or if we locate that one act of righteousness anywhere in the world except in one place and in one particular deed we ought not to preach."

I have thought it well to give these excerpts so that the reader, before he enters upon its perusal, may gain some conception of the rich store of God's truth that lies set before him. I think it quite unnecessary to say more about the volume. It is the richest and most helpful discussion of the deep things of God that it has ever been my good fortune to read. The man who masters this volume and whose heart becomes saturated with its truths, will be a ripe Christian, meet for the Master's use. Moreover, he will be thoroughly equipped for an intelligent discussion of God's great plan of saving men, and will be prepared for an effective defense of the gospel against any who, through ignorance, or through malice, may misunderstand or misrepresent its teachings.

J. S. Choate.

Dallas, Texas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
	EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION	v
I.	THE BOOK OF GALATIANS—AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PAUL'S VISIT TO JERUSALEM	13
III.	JUSTIFICATION OF A SINNER	23
IV.	JUSTIFICATION OF A SINNER (continued)	33
V.	INDUCTION INTO CHRIST	45
VI.	THE TWO COVENANTS	59
VII.	SPECIAL WARNINGS AND TEACHINGS	71
VIII.	THE BOOK OF ROMANS—INTRODUCTION	83
IX.	PAUL'S SALUTATION, THANKSGIVING AND PRAYER	101
X.	UNIVERSAL NECESSITY OF SALVATION	109
XI.	UNIVERSAL NECESSITY OF SALVATION (continued)	117
XII.	UNIVERSAL NECESSITY OF SALVATION (concluded)	137
XIII.	THE GOSPEL PLAN OF SALVATION	147
XIV.	THE SEMINAL IDEA OF SALVATION	157
XV.	SALVATION IN US	167
XVI.	SALVATION IN US (continued)	177
XVII.	FINAL WORK OF SALVATION IN US	187
XVIII.	HARMONY OF THE PROBLEM OF JEWISH UNBELIEF WITH THE PLAN OF SALVATION	197

PAGE

XIX. Limitations and Merciful Purpose of God's Rejection of Israel..... 209
XX. The Doctrine of Salvation by Grace Applied to Practical Life..... 215
XXI. Some Fragments of Chapters 14-16..... 225
XXII. The Book of Philippians—Introduction 231
XXIII. The Analysis and Exposition..... 243
XXIV. God's Providence in Paul's Life..... 253
XXV. The Deity of Christ..... 261
XXVI. Paul's Libation and the Christian's Growth in Grace..... 271
XXVII. The Ministry of Tears and Paul's Recipe for Happiness..... 283
XXVIII. The Book of Philemon..... 297

THE BOOK OF GALATIANS

I

AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION

Scriptures: Gal. 1 : 1-17 and all references

THE Letter to the Galatians is one of the second group of Paul's letters. The first group consists of I and II Thessalonians, and this group, mainly on the great controversy with Judaizing Christians, consists of I and II Corinthians, Galatians and Romans.

On the Letter to the Galatians we have abundant, good and accessible literature. The best book is by Lightfoot, and every preacher ought to have it in his library. I also commend Luther on Galatians. Galatians was the storehouse of Luther from which he drew the weapon of the Reformation. In short homilies he commented on this letter. His comments make a book of considerable size. Luther's "Commentary on Galatians" is very valuable in showing the crucial point at issue between the Protestants and the Romanists in the time of the Reformation. Its German style makes heavy reading to an Anglo-Saxon. John Wesley said it surprised him more than any other book of fame. Perhaps a large part of his surprise grew out of the fact that he and Luther were opposed on the doctrines of grace. The third book which I commend is Dr. Malcolm McGregor's "Divine Authority of Paul's Writings." He uses the Letter to the Galatians more than any other part of the scriptures.

This letter was evidently written A. D. 57 or possibly 56. It was written from Corinth or from Macedonia, with a strong probability in favor of Corinth. The Letter to the Galatians bears the relation to the Letter to the Romans that Jude does to II Peter, and that Colossians does to the Ephesians. The chief topic in Galatians and Romans is largely the same. It is as if the Letter to the Galatians were a fiery, off-hand sermon, and after the storm of combat had passed away, the preacher had quietly and calmly prepared a masterly treatise on the same subject, Romans being the great treatise and Galatians the off-hand discussion.

The occasion of the writing of the letter is very much the same as that of II Corinthians: Paul had been challenged as an apostle and his gospel assailed by the emissaries from Jerusalem. There are shades of difference between the issue at Corinth on this subject and the issue in the churches of Galatia and the church at Rome. But the most pronounced form of Judaistic teaching as contrary to the gospel of Jesus Christ is the form that he combats in this letter. He got word that almost the whole church had apostatized from what he considered the gospel, and had gone over root and branch to the Judaizers.

Here arises an important question which in modern times has developed considerable controversy. Does the N. T. use the word, "Galatia," in its ethnological sense or in its political sense? If it means Galatia as a place where the Galatians proper lived, there is very little reference in the Acts to Paul's preaching there. If it means the Roman province, including Galatia proper and certain sections of Phrygia and Lycaonia, then the churches in Galatia were the churches at Lystra, Derbe and Antioch of Pisidia. We have a full account of the establishment of these churches in the Acts. Dr. Ramsay, a very brilliant modern writer, has written a book to show that when Paul uses the term, "Galatia," he uses it in the sense of the Roman province

inhabited by the Galatians. About B.C. 25 Asia Minor fell under the power of Rome, which, disregarding the old-time ethnological boundaries relating to nations, established provinces for purposes of government, sometimes including three or four of these nations. Ramsay makes a remarkably strong argument which has never been satisfactorily answered. But he leaves unanswered some strong internal evidences on the other side. For example: (1) It is hard to harmonize the contents of this letter with the account in Acts of the establishment of the churches in Antioch of Pisidia, Lystra and Derbe. (2) All the characteristics of the people addressed in this letter fit better the Celtic population of Galatia proper. Like other Celts, whether in Gaul, Wales or Ireland, their emotions were easily excited and as quickly subsided. (See Conybeare & Howson's "Life and Epistles of Paul" on this point.) They were intensely emotional, easily enthused, bubbling over like a mountain spring, variable and illogical. So we commend the research and scholarship of Dr. Ramsay and respect his masterly argument, yet many, in view of the counter arguments, deny that he has fully sustained the contention. While I myself am charmed and delighted with his book, and sometimes carried away almost to the point of agreement with him, yet, in spite of my prepossessions in his favor, the pendulum swings back to the old position that Paul is writing to Galatians proper, and not to a different people artificially enclosed in the Roman province of Galatia. The silence in Acts concerning his establishing real Galatian churches is no more than its silence concerning much of his work in other places.

Now we come to a matter of history. How do we account for such a multitude of Gauls colonized in Asia Minor? There are three words used to describe these people: Celts, Gauls and Galatians. The Galatians evidently came from the territory that we now call France. Cæsar

tells us much of these Gauls—a restless people, bent on changes, migrating to broader fields. Earlier Roman history tells us that a great wave of these people crossed the Alps, swept over Italy, and under Brennus captured Rome itself. Later they passed into Greece and Macedonia, and a strong band, managing to get shipping, crossed the Bosporus into Asia Minor and settled a strip of country northwest of Tarsus about 200 miles wide and of considerable length. They went even farther and fought a great battle with the king of the Syrians, but were defeated. They were unlike the Romans, the Phrygians or the Greeks—they were Gauls. An Irishman is a Galatian—quick, passionate, fickle. We have in this letter to deal with a class of people unlike any other that the gospel has yet reached. It is strange that Luther in his commentary makes these Galatians Teutons, or Germans. The letter shows when Paul first preached to them how impressible they were, subject to quick, deep emotion. It was easy to get a foot-hold among them, and easy to lose it.

The occasion of Paul's preaching among them, as we learn from the letter itself and other sources, was providential; that he was taken, when trying to get to another point, with a great sickness—that thorn in the flesh—so that he was unable to travel because of his almost total blindness and feebleness, and that his preaching to them resulted in marvelous manifestations. The account harmonizes with the marvels of the recent great revival in Wales or with what has been called "the sanctified row" in a Methodist camp-meeting. Nowhere else in Paul's ministry was there such enthusiasm—such demonstrations in receiving his message. We learn in Acts of two visits that Paul made to Galatia.

The genuineness of the book has never been questioned. Men who are ready to deny the authenticity of other books of the Bible all agree that this is genuinely Pauline. I and

II Corinthians, Galatians and Romans have never been questioned. The letter seems to be divided into the following outline:

I. Introduction, 1:1-5.

II. Historical narrative, 1:6 to the end of chapter 2, in which he defends his gospel and apostolic authority.

III. The doctrinal part of the epistle, chapters 3 and 4, relating to justification by faith without works.

IV. Chapters 5 and 6 are devoted to exhortations based on the doctrine.

Let us take up the introduction: "Paul, an apostle (not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead)." Even in the introduction he strikes the key-note of the letter. In that parenthesis of the first sentence he marches square up against the opposition, the Judaizers having contended that he was neither one of the twelve, nor commissioned by them. He concedes the fact, but turns it in his favor. He *is* an apostle, though not of men, not as Matthias, who was elected, but he received his apostleship direct from the Lord. Usually Paul leads up to his subject by gradual approaches, but here he abruptly leaps into the middle of things. This letter is like dropping a coal of fire into a powder magazine.

"I marvel that ye are so quickly removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel; which is not another *gospel:* only there are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." At the outset he recognizes that this revolt did not originate with them. It was superinduced, imported. Nor did he believe that it was merely human opposition. It was a matter of amazement to him that people who had welcomed him so lovingly, heard him so tenderly and obeyed him so joyously, should, in such a short time, be switched off completely from the true gospel. All through the letter we see that the wonder

is in his mind, and he evidently attributes it to some power more than human: "O foolish Galatians, who did bewitch you, that you should turn a somersault in theology and doctrine so quickly?"

He does not mince words: "But though we, or an angel from Heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema." There is but one gospel—the gospel of grace through Jesus Christ. Anything different is not gospel, though an angel brings it. It is to be rejected, and the one who brings it should be counted as accursed from God. Paul was a mild man, exceedingly courteous and patient, suffering a great many personal indignities, but when one struck at the gospel he preached he was full of indignation and fiery wrath, because he believed that gospel to be the only hope of the lost world: "As we have said before, so say I now again, if any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that which ye received, let him be anathema."

The skeptic argues against the N. T. because so much of it is devoted to issues local and transitory. But this is to misread and misinterpret human history. The natural man is ever ready to prefer works to grace. If he cannot have a salvation all of works, then he insists on a salvation partly of works and partly of grace. He will at any time prefer rites and ceremonies to spiritual things. In medieval time, the dark ages preceding and necessitating the Reformation of the 16th century, all Europe under Roman Catholicism, reverted to the old covenant with its priesthood, sacraments, types, burdensome ritual and imposing customs and ceremonies, mixed up with compromises and borrowings from heathendom around. Luther made this letter the banner of the reformation for Central Europe, and we need it now as much as when Paul wrote it or Luther used it. There are hundreds of pulpits today that do not preach the gospel, and even some Baptists are aping Rome.

I am reminded of the interview I had with Sam Jones when he came to Waco. He was sick and I called on him. The first thing he asked me,

"What do you think of me? What do you think of my gospel?" I said,

"I think you are a thousand miles from the gospel. I would suggest that when you get back to that big congregation you preach a *gospel* sermon for variety, just to show what a different thing it is from what you are preaching. You are preaching pretty good morality. Not only are you not preaching the gospel, but you are creating a false impression on the public mind, that heeding what you preach they will be saved." He burst out laughing and said,

"I like you. You come to hear me when I get well and I will preach a gospel sermon."

He did preach a really great gospel sermon on the blood of Jesus Christ. But he stopped at that. In his next sermon he was picking his teeth before the audience and said,

"Look here, the thing to do is to join the church and then get religion. Join the church whether you have any more religion than a horse." Those were his exact words. I turned to Dr. King, a Presbyterian, and said,

"I think we just as well leave." And he said,

"Yes, I think so." And I did not go back any more.

Paul felt just that way—that the salvation of men was a matter too important to be trifled with, and there was only one thing that could save men and that was the gospel of Jesus Christ; that the church and ordinances were for the saved, not for the unsaved; that the gospel of Christ is a distinct thing from the moral or ceremonial law of Moses; that the preacher should preach the gospel of salvation, grace and freedom, and to go back to the weak and beggarly elements of the types was to Paul a matter of amazement.

He tells us how he got his gospel: "For I make known

to you, brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man." In other words, "I did not educate myself into this gospel and did not get my conception of it from any man on earth, but by direct revelation Jesus Christ made known to me what the gospel is." Some men now get their conceptions from reading Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. Paul did not; they were not then written. Some men get their conceptions from hearing others who had heard Christ. But the gospel facts were communicated directly to Paul, and that is why I insist on saying, "Five gospels—Matthew, Mark, Luke, John and Paul,"—and Paul's gospel is the most comprehensive of all. Note the beginning and the end of each gospel: Mark commences with Christ's public ministry and stops at Christ's resurrection. Matthew commences at Abraham and stops with the resurrection. Luke commences with Adam and stops with Paul in the City of Rome. John commences in eternity before the world was and stops with the revelation of Paradise regained. Paul commences where John does in eternity and goes beyond him to the turning over of the kingdom to the Father. Paul shows in Corinthians how he received his knowledge of the Lord's supper and his gospel: "For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus in the night in which He was betrayed took bread; and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also He took the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood; this do, as often as ye drink *it*, in remembrance of me" (I Cor. 11:23-25). "I make known unto you, brethren, the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye received, wherein also ye stand, by which also ye are saved, if ye hold fast the word which I preached unto you, except ye believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received: that Christ died for our sins

according to the scriptures; and that He was buried; and that He hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures" (I Cor. 15:1-4). As bearing upon the history of Paul, and as bearing upon the nature of the gospel that he preached, the Letter to the Galatians contains some historical facts of incalculable importance that can be found nowhere else.

He proceeds in the rest of the first chapter to recite what had been his attitude before his conversion; that he persecuted the church; that he had advanced beyond others in the Jewish religion, and was exceedingly zealous in the traditions of the fathers. In other words, these Galatians were going back where Paul was before he was converted. He adds that his being an apostle and in the ministry was not an afterthought with God, as some people teach. He scouts any such idea. He said, "God set me apart from my mother's womb." He was born about the time Christ was born. The mission of Paul was as clear to omniscience as the mission of Christ. To him all great things root back in eternity—in the divine purpose, in election, in predestination, in fore-ordination. He could not conceive of God as being surprised by some new set of events that had accidentally come to the front, necessitating a new adjustment to fit these unexpected events. "And called me through His grace, to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles." Notice the connection of the thought: "I was set apart from my mother's womb. When I got to be a man He revealed His Son to me, that is, in my conversion, and called me to preach to certain people."

He combats one of their objections that his information was second-hand: "Straightway I conferred not with flesh and blood; neither went I up to Jerusalem to them that were apostles before me; but I went away into Arabia; and again I returned into Damascus." There is a seeming conflict between Luke's "Straightway he preached in Damas-

cus," Acts 9:20, and Paul's "Straightway" in Gal. 1:15. He did commence to preach in Damascus, but he did not confer with any one, nor go up to Jerusalem to know if the men there would approve of what had been done, but he says, "I went away into Arabia," that is, he went to Mt. Sinai, and there, on the scene of the giving of the law, which these Jews are trying to persuade the Galatians is the way of salvation, he received his gospel and studied out the great problems of the meaning of the Sinaitic covenant and its contrast with the new covenant which he discusses in this letter in a way that we find nowhere else in the Bible.

The Galatian churches were going back to Mt. Sinai to be circumcised, to keep the whole law as a way of life, to put themselves in bondage to a yoke that their fathers were not able to bear—going back to a covenant that gendered bondage and ended in death. He is compelled to say, "I went away into Arabia." In other words, "God sent me there before He sent me to preach, that I should understand the difference between the law and the gospel; that I should, on the scene of the giving of the law, comprehend the purposes of that law."

QUESTIONS

1. What books constitute the first group of Paul's letters, and what books the second?
2. What three books on Galatians commended?
3. What the date of his letter?
4. Where written?
5. What relation does this letter bear to the Letter to the Romans? Give two examples of such relation.
6. What was the occasion of this letter?
7. Where was Galatia, what do we know from Acts about its people, and what churches were in Galatia?
8. What is Dr. Ramsay's contention, and what your reply?
9. Who were the Galatians, and what their characteristics?
10. Give an account of their migration into Asia Minor.
11. What was the occasion of Paul's preaching to them, and what the results?
12. Locate in Acts the account of two visits that Paul made to Galatia.

13. What of the genuineness of the book?
14. Give a brief outline of the book.
15. What charge against him may be inferred from his introduction, and how does he reply to it?
16. How did Paul regard his gospel?
17. What is the importance of this letter, and what the author's illustration?
18. What is the fifth gospel, and how does it compare with the other four as to their beginning and end?
19. What was Paul's attitude before his conversion, and what great doctrine does he make the basis of his conversion and call into the ministry?
20. How does Paul answer their charge that his gospel was second-hand?
21. Where in Acts may we insert the history in Gal. 1:16, 17?
22. Why did Paul go into Arabia before he commenced to preach, how long there, and what the bearing of these facts on Christianity? (See author's sermon on, "But I Went into Arabia.)"

II

PAUL'S VISIT TO JERUSALEM

Scriptures: Gal. 1:18—2:21

THIS discussion commenced at Galatians 1:18 and extends through chapter 2, completing the historical part of the letter. It is evident that there is a relation between Paul's visits to Jerusalem, the headquarters of the apostles, and his independent authority as an apostle and his special gospel. There is a special value of this Letter to the Galatians in that it gives definite information concerning matters more briefly and more generally given in Acts, which certainly saves us from erroneous inferences that would necessarily be deduced from the account in Acts alone. This is most evident in the history of Paul's visits to Jerusalem after his conversion, and the intervals between the visits. Five of these visits are recorded in Acts, as follows: First visit—Acts 9:26-30 and 22:17-21; second visit—Acts 11:27-30 and 12:25; third visit—Acts 15:1-30; fourth visit—Acts 18:22 (this one we would not know if we did not look closely at the Greek); fifth visit—Acts 21:15—23:25.

These are the five visits, so far as Acts records them, of Paul to Jerusalem after his conversion. I raise two additional questions: (1) What visits had he made to Jerusalem before his conversion? And (2) did he ever visit Jerusalem after the history in Acts closes? The answer to which is that while he lived at Tarsus he received his theological education at Jerusalem; that was doubtless his first visit, at least it is the first of which we have any account. But as he did not know Christ personally, he evidently was

not in Jerusalem during the life-time of Christ; therefore he must have gone back to Tarsus. But we do find him again in Jerusalem a Rabbi of the Cilician synagogue, an opponent of Stephen and a member of the Sanhedrin, and the object of his second visit was to become a member of the Sanhedrin, but that is all before his conversion.

After the history in the book of Acts closes we have no means of knowing that Paul ever visited Jerusalem. Indeed, we have only scraps of information concerning what he did after the first imprisonment at Rome. We gather some information from the Letters to Timothy and Titus. Whether that included another visit to Jerusalem we do not know.

What is the relation of his visit to Jerusalem to his special and independent gospel and his independent apostolic authority? The Roman Catholics teach that Peter was the first pope, and that all authority was derived from Peter; therefore if their position be correct, Paul must have derived his authority from Peter. This Letter to the Galatians grinds to fine powder the whole Roman Catholic theory of the pope, and hence it was one of the books of the N. T. that was so tremendously read in the Reformation.

Of the first and third of these visits to Jerusalem, recorded by Luke in Acts, we find parallel accounts in this Letter to the Galatians. There was no occasion in this letter to refer to the second visit to Jerusalem, for at that time he simply went up to carry some alms to Jerusalem, and had no opportunity to have any conversation with the apostles. The persecution was raging; James was killed and Peter was in prison, and as soon as Peter got out he left; so, that visit to Jerusalem is not germane to our discussion, but the third visit is. The fourth and fifth visits to Jerusalem cannot touch this letter because they took place after this letter was written; so that the thing that we are to study in this chapter is the bearing of these two visits

upon Paul's independent, apostolic authority and his independent gospel, viz.: The first visit, as recorded in Acts 9 and the parallel account in Galatians 1, and the third visit, as recorded in Acts 15 and paralleled by Galatians 2.

We may best get at the additional and more definite information in this letter by comparing the two accounts thus:

First, by reading Acts 9:17-19, then Gal. 1:15-17, then Acts 9:20-25, then Gal. 1:18 (except last clause), then Acts 9:26, 27, then Gal. 1:18 (last clause) to 20, then Acts 9:28, 29 (except last clause), then Acts 22:17-21, then Acts 9:29 (last clause) to 31, and then Gal. 1:21-24 (For an arrangement of these passages in parallel columns see "Interpretation of Acts," chapter 18).

The following are the new and more definite particulars that we gather from inserting the Galatian passage that way: First, we learn from Galatians the time interval, three years, between his conversion and his first visit to Jerusalem. That three years after he was converted had passed before he ever saw Jerusalem or any of the twelve apostles. Second, we learn what he did in this interval of three years and what he did not: (1) That his call to the apostleship was not only *directly* from the Lord himself, but his acceptance of it and obedience to it was instant, without conferring with flesh and blood. His call was not at Jerusalem but at Damascus, not through Peter, but through Christ directly; Christ did not tell him to go to Peter, but the Holy Spirit selected the special man, Ananias, and sent him to him. (2) That, as his call to the apostleship was not dependent on the ratification of the twelve, he was set apart from his mother's womb. (3) That his apostolic call had its emphasis in a different direction from the emphasis of the call of the twelve apostles, their mission being to preach to the Jews primarily, and his being to preach primarily to the Gentiles. (4) That instead of having been instructed in the gospel by the original twelve,

he went, not to Jerusalem, but to Arabia to receive his gospel from the Lord himself by direct revelation. (5) That instead of waiting to act on his call to preach until the twelve refused it or authorized it, he commenced his preaching at Damascus and not at Jerusalem. (6) That he had been exercising his apostolic call and receiving revelations and preaching for three years before he was ever seen by any of the original twelve. (7) That when he did go to Jerusalem he saw only one of the apostles—Peter—but he saw James, the brother of our Lord, who was not an apostle. So we must infer that at the time of his visit the other eleven apostles were out on the field. He saw but one, and he was there only fifteen days, and while there that fifteen days Jesus in a vision in the temple peremptorily ordered him to leave them, to go to the Gentile work. See how these points are brought out and urged by the Judaizing Christians, inasmuch as he was not one of the twelve, and not commissioned by the twelve, therefore he was not a true apostle. He is explaining all this in his defense. (8) That for nine years after leaving Jerusalem, while he was preaching and establishing churches in Syria and Cilicia, they did not see his face. It was during this Cilician period that he received the revelation recorded in II Cor. 13. So that not a shred of his authority as an apostle, not a word of his gospel, is derived from the original twelve or from any other man. Galatians says nothing about the fact, but I will interpolate, that from Antioch he and Barnabas went to the heathen on their first missionary tour, not under Jerusalem direction, but under specific and direct authority of the Holy Spirit.

The object of Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, after he had finished his Cilician tour, was simply to carry alms to the poor saints in Jerusalem, because of a revelation of a famine through a prophet. There could have been no conversation with the apostles from the fact that the persecu-

tion by Herod was raging, in which James was killed, and when Peter got out of prison he immediately left. There is another matter stated in Acts, though Galatians does not refer to it. We find in Acts 13 and 14 that when he did go out as a foreign missionary he did not go under any authority conferred by the twelve apostles, but that he and Barnabas were sent out particularly by the Holy Spirit, and that this first missionary tour that we find recorded was under special, direct orders from God and not from man.

In order to get at the account of his third visit to Jerusalem we have to carefully read nearly all of Acts 15 and every bit of Gal. 2. The object of this visit was (1) to find out how these Judaizing Christians were supported, (2) to carry out this divine injunction. (He says in the Letter to the Galatians that when he made those three visits to Jerusalem he did not go because he was summoned, but by special revelation, showing that he was still under divine guidance.) (3) To show that the initiative was not taken by the Jerusalem church, but by the church at Antioch. Certain Judaizing Christians had a gospel similar to that of those who had come to Antioch and taught that they could not be saved without becoming Jews—that they would have to be circumcised or faith would not save them at all. Paul and Barnabas squarely met them, but inasmuch as the disturbance had come on the ground of comity, they carried the question to the church where it originated. Just as one would do if he were the pastor of the Broadway Church in Fort Worth, and some of the people of Dallas were to come and raise a row in the church—a row that involved his ministerial authority—then he ought to refer this to those Dallas people, saying, "Do you send these men here, or do they come by your authority?" So we see that in that third visit to Jerusalem he went with a definite object in view, not in order that he might be made an apostle, but in order to settle a great question of salvation, and that very question was

being agitated in the Galatian church then, that is, the necessity of being a Jew in order to be saved.

Galatians says that Paul went to that meeting to take a test case, and the test case was Titus. Titus was converted, had been baptized and received into the church, and he determined to take Titus up there and say, "Now do you demand that Titus shall be circumcised in order to be saved?" Then he went up as he said, by revelation, to have the matter settled forever as to whether he was an apostle to the Gentiles or not. So we learn in Galatians that when he got there and sprung that question upon Titus, though Titus was not circumcised, they lost the case. Then we learn from Galatians that before the church met in conference Paul had met the elders and the pastor of the church, James, and sprung this question on them, "Do you acknowledge that this authority that I have to go to the heathen is from God, just as your authority to go to the circumcision is from God?" And he said that they conceded and gave him the right hand of fellowship, he and Barnabas only. This is a very important matter that we learn from chapter 2, but that isn't all that we learn. He says that from them he received nothing; that they conceded that he was not behind them in anything; that the pillars of the church at Jerusalem—the apostles and the pastor—acknowledged that they conferred nothing on him, and that he was their equal. He did not get his gospel from them, but this is not the cream of the case. He adds something that we do not find anywhere else. The Holy Spirit and the apostles and the church at Jerusalem united in the decision, embodied it in writing upon all of these points, and sent it to the churches where these questions were likely to come up.

We come now to a most startling fact. After this happened Peter made a visit to Antioch, and when he first got there he did as he did in the case of Cornelius—took a meal with the Gentiles. Here come some people from Jerusalem,

and while they admit that a man did not have to become a Jew to be a Christian, yet they contend that they must not violate the old law about eating with the Gentiles. We learn from Galatians that it shook Peter, and we have already learned that Peter was easily shaken, and that it shook Barnabas also. In this new question we learn that Paul alone stood up and contended to Peter's face and rebuked him. What a position for a pope! He told him that he was tearing down what he had already established; that what God at Joppa had shown him that He had cleansed, man should not call unclean. But Peter was dissimulating and holding back because certain of these Judaizing teachers from Jerusalem came up there and insisted that this business must stop.

What would have been the effect if Paul had not taken the stand he did? Christianity would have been a mere sect; it would have lost its individuality; its wings would have been clipped; it could neither fly nor soar; it could only crawl, and it would have perished at Jerusalem but for that fight that Paul made. What would we think if the "upper tens" of our church would say, "I am willing to welcome these poor people to the church, but don't expect me to go to see them. We can't do that?" I have always contended that but for Paul's going away into Arabia and receiving his gospel direct from the Lord Jesus Christ, instead of having it handed down to him by somebody else, and the stand that he took when this great controversy threatened to rend Christianity of that day in its struggling childhood, we Gentiles would have had no gospel, and what the Jews would have had would not have been worth anything. It was a question of life and death. The very essence of the gospel was involved. It was as if they proposed to take the key-stone out of the arch, or the foundation from under the building.

There are some incidental questions on chapters 1 and 2

that we had better look at a little. Paul said that when he went to Jerusalem that first time, he saw James, our Lord's brother. Here come up some theories. The extreme theory held by the Catholic church, the middle theory held by the church of England and the other theory held by Baptists, viz.: What is meant by calling these the Lord's brothers and sisters? The Catholics say that they were only His cousins; that Mary never bore but one child; that she was born a virgin, so she remained a virgin, and they claim that her body was taken up to heaven as was the body of Elijah —"the Assumption of the Virgin"—and that she was immaculately conceived, as Christ was conceived. That is what they call the doctrine of "the Immaculate Conception." The second theory is that they were children of Joseph by a former marriage. But there is not a hint of such a marriage in the Bible. The third theory is that they were children of Joseph and Mary, the mother of our Lord. People, who, for sentimental reasons, believe that Mary had not a lot of children after Christ, who believe that they were not Mary's children, evolve that thing out of their own consciousness. The fact is that James and Jude who wrote books of the New Testament, and some sisters were actually half-brothers and sisters of our Lord, and the children of Joseph and Mary. They were half-brothers of Jesus because they had the same mother, but their father was not His; God was His father.

Another thing Paul says is that those churches in Judea from whom it was alleged that he derived his authority and his gospel, did not even know his name, but they held him in respect and glorified God in him. I took that as my text when I was appointed to preach the annual sermon before the American Baptist Publication Society in Chicago—"They glorified God in Paul"—showing that the workman is known by his works. They said there was a mighty revolution in this Saul of Tarsus; that somebody did it, and

glory to the One that did it. Somebody made him the mightiest power as an evangelical force that earth has ever known. Who did it? God. So they glorified God in Paul, and brethren will glorify God in us as our lives are pure and as our work is faithful, but if we live in sin as any other sinner, and if we preach something that God did not give us to preach, if conviction and conversion do not follow our ministry, if our preaching does not stir up others, then I am sure that people will never attempt to glorify God in us. They will find nothing to glorify.

QUESTIONS

1. What the special value of this Letter to the Galatians?
2. In what particular is this most evident?
3. How many and what visits of Paul to Jerusalem recorded in Acts, and what the scripture for each?
4. What visits had he made to Jerusalem before his conversion, and what the proof?
5. Did Paul ever visit Jerusalem after the history in the book of Acts closes?
6. What is the relation of his visit to Jerusalem to his special and independent gospel and his independent apostolic authority?
7. To which of these visits recorded in Acts do we find parallel accounts in Galatians, and why are not the other visits to Jerusalem referred to in Galatians?
8. Where in Acts are the sections corresponding to the two visits to Jerusalem recorded in Galatians?
9. How may we best get at the additional and more definite information in this letter?
10. What are these new and more definite particulars that we gather from inserting the Galatian passages in the Acts passages?
11. What was the object of Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, and what opportunity did this visit afford for conversation with the twelve apostles, and why?
12. What matter stated in Acts brought in here by the author?
13. What the object of Paul's third visit to Jerusalem, what the case at Antioch, and what two important matters were settled authoritatively on this visit?
14. What social question sprang up at Antioch soon after this, what its history, how settled, and what if Paul had not taken the stand that he did?
15. What the bearing of Paul's independent gospel and apostleship, together with Gal. 1:12—2:14 on the alleged primacy and supremacy of Peter?
16. What the three theories of our Lord's relation to James, and which is the true one?
17. What did Paul here say of the churches in Judea, and how may the people glorify God in the preacher?

III

JUSTIFICATION OF A SINNER BEFORE GOD

Scripture: Gal. 3:1-14

WE commence this chapter with a great question, not how shall a man as originally created in righteousness, knowledge and true holiness be justified before God, but how shall a fallen, depraved, sinful and condemned man be made just before God? This is the great question that Paul discusses. While this question is treated fragmentarily in many passages of both the Old and New Testament, it is discussed elaborately and logically in only two books—Galatians and Romans—the latter speedily following the former. So far as Galatians is concerned, the argument is confined to chapters 3, 4 and 5, and as the argument is continuous without a break, it is a pity to have it broken up into chapter divisions. These discussions will disregard the chapter divisions and follow the one line of thought straight through, classifying and numbering the several points as they are logically developed in the progress of the argument.

So far in this book, *i.e.,* in chapters 1 and 2, we have considered the author of the letter in his apostolic call and qualifications, and his independent gospel received by direct revelation. But now we turn to his discussion of the great question as stated above. The intent of the argument is to convict the Galatians of their folly and sin in leaving the gospel they had received and relapsing into Judaism, if Jews, or turning to Judaism for salvation if Gentiles. However, in making his argument, Paul employs many striking antitheses, or contrasts. A mere glance through the three

chapters enables one to note the more important of these striking antitheses, and as the power of the argument lies most in his way of putting these contrasts, we should carefully consider each one as it comes up in the progress of the discussion proper or the exhortation based thereon. These antitheses are as follows:

1. The works of the law versus the hearing of faith.

2. The Spirit, or its fruit, versus the flesh, or its fruits. In the fifth chapter, putting things in contrast, he says, "The works of the flesh are manifest, etc. * * * But the fruit of the Spirit is love." He tells what they are, just as if he had put two trees before us. A tree is to be known by its fruits. One tree bears blasphemy, lust, hatred, malice and strife. This is the tree of the flesh, and is a bad tree because its fruits are bad. The other tree bears joy, love, peace, etc. I say his favorite method in this letter is to argue by antitheses, putting one thing over against another. To form an antithesis is to take two theses and show how they are diametrically opposite. "Antithesis" is one thesis against another thesis. The first one, as we have said, is the works of the law versus the hearing of faith. The second is the Spirit, or its fruit, versus the flesh, or its fruit. The third is the curse of the law versus the redemption of Christ. The fourth is the law versus the promises. Salvation does not come by law; it comes from the Spirit. The fifth is the covenant with Abraham versus the law-covenant with Moses. If in any place in the world these covenants are held up in contrast, we find it in this letter. He says the covenant with Abraham was 430 years before the law, and that it was a covenant that God made and ratified. It could not be disannulled by the covenant made for another purpose 430 years later. Sixth, this antithesis, which appears more evident in the Greek, is —The child (*pais*) led by a slave, and under tutors versus the son (*huios*) come to freedom and inheritance. Or to

put it in another form, the bondage of tutelage versus the freedom of the adoption of sons after one comes into his inheritance. Seventh, Mt. Sinai versus Jerusalem, the allegory of the slave-woman who is a mere concubine, and bears children unto bondage. The slave-woman bearing children unto bondage versus the free woman or lawful wife bearing children unto freedom, is this antithesis. Eighth, born after the flesh versus born after the Spirit. Paul says that he that was born after the flesh was Ishmael; that Isaac was the one that was born supernaturally, or according to promise. Ninth, the circumcision of the flesh versus regeneration, or circumcision of the heart (for the expansion of this thought see Romans 2:28, 29). Tenth, the Jew, or one nation circumcising males only, versus the fact that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female; all are baptized unto Christ. The woman is initiated, we may say, through baptism as well as the man, but the woman was counted but little under the Mosaic covenant, as there only the male children received the sign of the covenant. So we see that the force of this argument lies in the way of putting these contrasts. We do well to study these antitheses.

Since this section deals with such a great subject and is so greatly discussed, we will take it verse by verse. The first point that he makes is that it was not only folly in them before whose eyes Jesus Christ was openly set forth crucified, *i.e.*, for a man that had believed in the crucified Christ in order to salvation, to turn away from salvation by faith to the works of the law, but it was folly superinduced by some evil superhuman means: "Oh, foolish Galatians [there is the folly], who hath bewitched you?" That is, "you are not acting honestly; you could not be guilty of such folly as this if there was not exercising on you some evil influence that impelled you to go wrong." The thought would have been the same if he had said, "O, foolish Gala-

tians, who did bewitch you, to turn you away from Christ to the Mosaic law?" It was the hallucination of the devil, no matter who the human instrument was. There was a Jew from Jerusalem that did it.

His next argument is, that the Spirit that they received when they were converted came by the hearing of faith, and not by the works of the law. See how he says it: "This only would I learn from you: received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" This is an appeal to their past experience, as if to say, "Let us go back to the time you were converted, and you received the Spirit, the witness of the Spirit, or the Spirit shining into your hearts to lead you to the knowledge of Jesus Christ. This is the greatest thing. The question is, Did that come to you by conformity to the Mosaic law, or did you hear the preaching of Christ crucified and believe? Did it come by faith?" This is a pretty searching question, going back to their conversion.

Notice the next point, "Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now perfected in the flesh?" In other words, "How did your religious life start? It started in the Spirit. Now do you want to perfect what was started in the Spirit by going back to the flesh?" Just as the hearing of faith stands opposite to the law, so the work of the Spirit stands opposite to the works of the flesh. If we start in one principle, perfection comes by following up that principle. The teaching is that he who hath begun a good work in us, will perfect it unto the day of Jesus Christ. The next point is, "Did ye suffer so many things in vain, if it be indeed in vain?" In other words, "It is for the consideration of righteousness through faith that ye were persecuted, and because you, by the hearing of faith, received Jesus as your Savior, and the Spirit as your guide, you had to suffer a great many things. If you turn to another system, then the value of that suffering is all passed away."

Here is a nice little question of interpretation, "Did ye suffer so many things in vain? If it be indeed in vain." What does it mean by saying, "If it be indeed in vain?" There are two interpretations, one of which assumes that they started right which he had hope to believe; then the suffering that characterized that start would not be in vain; though they might temporarily be turned aside, they would come back. But there is another interpretation which is probably the right one, viz.: this suffering that they received would not be in vain from a Christian standpoint. If they were not Christians it would have meant something worse than in vain, *i.e.*, even if indeed it was just in vain it would bring to them a disaster greater than the sufferings that they first experienced. I never saw a book in my life where more care should be taken in the interpretation of the words.

In verse 5 he thus presents another view of the point about their receiving the Spirit by the hearing of faith: "He therefore that supplieth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth He it by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith?" In other words, "It is God that ministered the Spirit to you, and it is God that worked the miracles among you." Having looked at that subjectively, let us look at it again. "You received the Spirit certainly by the hearing of faith. When He ministered it, did He minister it on the condition that you would keep the law of Moses, or was it on the condition of faith?" Christ said in one place that He could not do many mighty works because they lacked faith in the miracle-working power. So that God who ministered to them spoke on the condition of faith, and they received the Spirit by the hearing of faith. God ministered the Spirit to them on the condition that they believe in the miracle-working power for such a purpose.

We come now to a new point that extends down to the end of verse 17. In verses 6 and 7 he presents a new argu-

ment—the parallel between Abraham's faith and the Christian faith. Abraham believed on God and it was imputed unto him for righteousness. Genesis 15 shows when Abraham was converted. It is the first place in which the Incarnate Word presented himself to Abraham in a vision, and it is said he believed in Jehovah and He reckoned, or imputed it to him for righteousness. This is the first time we find the phrase, "imputed righteousness." He imputed Christ's righteousness to him through faith. Abraham believed in Jehovah; Jehovah imputed or reckoned it unto him for righteousness. Now Paul's argument is this: Who is the father of the whole Jewish people? Abraham. How did Abraham become just before God? How was he justified? He was reckoned righteous. Righteousness was imputed to him; he was not righteous through his works, but he became just before God through faith in another. What conclusion does he draw from that? "Know therefore that they that are of faith, the same are sons of Abraham." These Jews whom these Judaizing teachers attempted to turn to the law as a means of salvation are the children of Abraham by faith. They are not his children according to the flesh, but the true children of Abraham are those who have faith in God. Abraham had faith; those are his children who have faith. As he says, "Know therefore that they that are of faith, the same are sons of Abraham," just as he argues that he is not a Jew who is one outwardly, but who is one inwardly.

We now come to one of the strongest testimonies to the inspiration of the Bible. "The scripture, foreseeing"—there the scripture is personified, as having the prophetic gift. The scripture foresaw that God would justify the Gentiles by faith and preached the gospel beforehand unto Abraham. The scripture saw that in the ages to come the whole world would become the children of Abraham and preached the gospel to him. In what expression did it preach it? Where

it says, "In thee shall all the nations be blessed." The blessings could not come to all the nations as children of Abraham by lineal descent, so they are to be children by faith in Jesus Christ. We understand that when Abraham came out of Ur of the Chaldees that God said to Abraham, "In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." If that interpretation of the scriptures is right, then this follows, presented in the next verse: "So then they that are of faith are blessed with the faithful Abraham." "In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." What was the blessing? Justification. They are to be justified before God. That is what the scripture foresaw and therefore any one may receive the blessing of justification and become the child of Abraham.

In verse 10 he brings up a new witness for his argument —the testimony of the law itself: "You want to go back and seek salvation from the law, but what does the law say? As many as are under the law are under the curse, for it is written [written in the law] cursed is every one who continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them." If they should go back to the law-system of salvation he tells them to listen to what the law says: "If you ever make a break, if you turn to the right hand or to the left hand, if you violate the law in any single instance, you are cursed."

In verse 11 he makes still another argument and we must distinguish between these arguments: "Now that no man is justified by the law before God, is evident; for, the righteous shall live by faith." This is from Hab. 2:4. That is the testimony of the prophet. The prophet comes in now to support his general line of argument. The law says, "You shall continue to live by continually living in perfect obedience." Hab. 2:4 says, "The just man [the man who hath justification] continues to live by faith." He starts by faith and keeps on by faith. This brings us to a general ques-

tion: This passage in Habakkuk is quoted three times by Paul—in the passage here, in Rom. 1:17, and also in Heb. 10:28. In how many senses did Paul use that passage, "The just shall live by faith?" For instance, it means in one place that the just by faith shall live, in another place that the justified shall continue to live by faith, and then when we examine that brief passage in Hebrews we see how the inspired apostle keeps getting meanings out of a passage of scripture. It is like drawing many buckets out of a well, and still the well is not exhausted. He goes on to say that this prophet distinctly says that the just shall live by faith. Then he says, "But you know what the law says." We have to put what the law says over against the "by faith." We know that the law is not by faith, but it is by perfect obedience—"He that doeth these things." Moses described the righteousness of the law, saying that they that do these things shall live by them, and then he says, "But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise." Thus he presents it in contrast.

Verse 13 says: "You seek to go back to the law, but when you go back you are under the curse, for Christ redeemed us from under the curse of the law. When you turn from Christ to Judaism you turn from redemption to the curse itself." Redemption means to buy back, and that is why Christ died for us. He redeemed us from the curse of the law. Now, he says, "having become a curse for us," that is, He became the vicarious expiation (vicarious means "in place of another"); Christ became a curse for us, as it is written, "Cursed is every man that hangeth on a tree." What was the object of Christ's redeeming us from the curse of the law? He says in verse 14 that upon the Gentiles might come the blessings of Christ that we might receive the promise of grace through faith.

I commend "The Bible Commentary" and "Lightfoot's Commentary," which as a rule are safe commentaries. "The

Bible Commentary" is safer than the Cambridge Bible, and ten thousand times safer than the Expositor's Bible. I also recommend Luther's "Commentary on Galatians."

QUESTIONS

1. Where may we find an elaborate discussion of how a fallen, depraved, sinful and condemned man can be made just before God?
2. What is the intent of the argument thus made in Galatians?
3. How is this argument set forth?
4. Give the ten antitheses of this argument.
5. What folly does Paul charge the Galatians with committing, who was responsible for it primarily, and who secondarily?
6. What the argument based upon their experience?
7. What is the principle of attaining perfection, and the argument based thereon?
8. Give the argument based on their past sufferings, and interpret the expression, "If it be indeed in vain."
9. Give the argument based on their reception of the miraculous gift of the Spirit.
10. What the argument based on the parallel between Abraham's faith and the Christian's faith?
11. What the testimony of the law itself on this point?
12. What the prophet's testimony on this point?
13. Give Paul's three applications of Hab. 2:4.
14. What the argument based upon the fact that Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, and what the object of our redemption?
15. What books commended?

IV

JUSTIFICATION OF A SINNER BEFORE GOD
(Continued)

Scripture: Gal. 3:15-22

THIS discussion commences at Galatians 3:15, thus: "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men: though it be but a man's covenant, yet when it hath been confirmed, no one maketh it void, or addeth thereto."

There is no reference to that in either the Sinaitic covenant or the grace covenant. Man's law concerning a covenant between men requires that the agreement be kept according to its terms, whether verbal or written. Nothing not expressed can be added or substituted. A mental reservation on the part of neither of the makers of the covenant, nor any after-thought on the part of either can be considered in human law. So long as the covenant is tentative, *i.e.*, under consideration, terms of agreement may be modified, but when it is consummated and ratified it must stand on the terms expressed. This applies not only to all trades between individuals but to all treaties between nations. Even in human judgment Paul means to say that the character of man or nation stands impeached when a ratified covenant is broken. Disgrace attaches to the covenant breaker. See in Paul's terrible arraignment of the heathen the odious place and company of "covenant breakers" (Rom. 1:29). Here he is showing the immorality of the heathen life in that they have refused to have God in their knowledge. God gave them up, "Being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity; whisperers, back-

biters, hateful to God, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers." If we notice the place that covenant breakers occupy in that, and also notice the company in which they are placed, we get a conception of how, even human law, judges a man that breaks a covenant. The brand of infamy burned on the covenant breaker derives its odium, not merely from the fact that all social order depends upon the keeping of faith according to compact, but from the fact that ratification involves an appeal to God as witness to the compact made in His name and under oath expressed or implied. See Heb. 6:16, and compare the covenant between Abraham and Abimelech (Gen. 21:22-32). There is a covenant between two men. After clearly stating the terms of the covenant, sacrifices are offered, and the oath to God is taken that they will keep that covenant. Then turning to Gen. 31:44-53, we read the covenant between Jacob and Laban, his father-in-law. There again is an oath and a memorial called Mizpah: "God shall witness between thee and me as to how we keep this covenant." The brand of infamy burned on the covenant breaker derives its significance from the customs among nations of regarding a compact of that kind as being made under witness of God and under oath to God. It is in this light that we understand the famous scripture describing the citizen of Zion, in Psalm 15: "Lord who shall ascend unto thy holy hill? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart and that sweareth to his own hurt and that changeth not," that is, a man makes a trade with his fellow-man and afterwards finds out that the trade is very disadvantageous to him; he must not take it back; he swore to his own hurt but he didn't change; he stood up to his word, that is, having made the compact he sticks to it, no matter how disadvantageous to him, and in this light we understand the reproach cast upon the Carthaginians by the Romans in the proverb,

"Punic faith," because, as they alleged, the Carthaginians violated solemn treaties ratified by oath and sacrificed to the gods. I am explaining in giving this illustration what Paul means by saying, "I speak after the manner of men." Luther, in his comment on this verse, is mistaken in limiting the meaning of the *diatheke* (covenant) to man's last will and testament. In only two verses in the New Testament is *diatheke* to be rendered a "last will and testament," viz.: Heb. 9:16, 17, where the author finds a resemblance on one point between a covenant which becomes binding when ratified by the blood of the sacrifice and a will which becomes binding on the death of the testator.

But Paul's argument here is from the lesser to the greater. If man's law will not permit the annulment of a covenant ratified between men by any subsequent emergency or afterthought, how much more God's promise to Abraham (Gen. 12:1-13) concerning all nations could not be annulled by the Sinaitic law-covenant with one nation.

The force of the argument is overwhelming as Paul develops it:

1. The Sinaitic covenant was 430 years after the solemn promise of God concerning all nations.

2. The "seed" of the promise in Abraham's case is one; He says, "of seed" not seeds; not many as in the law-covenant; there the seed of Abraham with which that covenant was made is plural, about 3,000,000 of them standing there. A covenant of one kind made with the multitude cannot annul a promise which is given to one person.

3. The promise carried a blessing through the one seed, Christ, to all nations, whereas the law-covenant, while it was with the fleshly seed of Abraham—lineal descendants (plural), a great multitude—concerned one nation only.

4. The first was by promise and not by law; hence a vast difference in the terms or conditions of inheritance. An inheritance by promise cannot be an inheritance by law,

and vice versa. It will be noticed that this section says in the next place that this promise to Abraham was confirmed before of God. When was it confirmed and how was it confirmed? It was confirmed when Abraham offered up Isaac as set forth in Gen. 22. It was given before, but it was confirmed then, and it was confirmed by an oath. Men confirm what they say by an oath. Witnesses go into court concerning a pending murder trial, and every man and woman of them has to swear to the evidence given. Men confirm their testimony by an oath. In the Letter to the Hebrews the author says, "For when God made promise to Abraham, since He could swear by none greater, He sware by himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. And thus, having patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men swear by the greater; and in every dispute of theirs the oath is final for confirmation. Wherein God, being minded to show more abundantly unto the heirs of the promise the immutability of His counsel, interposed with an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it is impossible for God to lie, we may have a strong encouragement, who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us: which we have as an anchor of the soul, a hope both sure and steadfast and entering into that which is within the veil; whither as a forerunner Jesus entered for us, having become a high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." Or, as Paul expressed it in Romans 4: "For this cause it is of faith, that it may be according to grace; to the end that the promise may be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all. Mark the reason that the promise might be sure to all seed. The law covenant could not make things sure, it could not in its time, for it had to be repeated every day, every week, every month, every year and so over and over again. It could not be made sure, be-

cause if they kept the law one day, or one year, or one hundred years and then violated it in one particular the next year, they were out; it could not be sure. But the inheritance by promise is absolutely sure, because it is based on a promise.

Now, I will give an explanation of the last clause of verse 17 of this chapter and of verses 18, 19 and 20, of which no commentary known to me has ever given a satisfactory explanation. I might cite many different explanations. In the 17th verse Paul distinguishes between the grace-covenant confirmed of God and announced to Abraham and the promise of that covenant given to Abraham, and argues that the law-covenant given 430 years later for quite another purpose and to different persons could not disannul that promise. In the verses following up to the 20th he is not contrasting the grace-covenant with the law-covenant but the promise of the grace-covenant with the law-covenant. Just here come the words hard to be understood: "Now a mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is one." How are these words to be construed relevantly with the argument? I am able to see but one way. The law was given through a mediator because there were two distinct parties between whom Moses should be the "go-between" or mediator. But in the case of the promise there was only one party, God, who of grace freely promises. Hence, there is no need of a mediator in the case of a promise. "God is one," not two. God promises of himself. In the law-covenant there were two, God and the people. His point is just this, that the law-covenant had two parties to it, and these parties being at variance, a mediator, Moses, was employed to bring them into agreement. In order to have the mediator there must be two parties, but in a promise, there is only one and that is God, no mediator, but a promise. An inheritance by promise cannot be an inheritance by law, and vice versa.

5. The nature of the inheritance was different. The object of the promise was to secure spiritual blessings and a heavenly country; the object of the law was to secure earthly blessings and an earthly Canaan.

6. In a naked promise of pure grace there is no mediator because there is only one, not two, and He, of pure grace in himself, not from obligation of a compact with nations, promises a blessing to all nations, but as there were two parties in the law-covenant there was a necessity for the mediator, Moses, the "go-between" of the two parties. It is impossible to interpret intelligently the last clause of verse 17 and verses 18, 19 and 20, if we ignore the fact that Paul in these particular passages is contrasting, not covenant with covenant, but promise with covenant. He does indeed in this last clause of verse 17 and throughout verses 18, 19 and 20, contrast promise with covenant in order to show how inheritance comes. There is no mediator in a promise, because there is only one party, God, who of pure grace in himself, promises, and not of a compact-obligation. At Sinai were distinctly two parties; God, the party of the first part, proposes a covenant to the Jewish nation, the party of the second part, through a mediator, Moses. But when He promised that in Abraham's seed, singular number, meaning Christ, all the families of nations, nations of the earth, should be blessed, God, who is only one, was indeed present, but the nations, thousands of them yet unborn, were not present. Hence there was no compact between God and the nations, and hence no mediator was necessary. The nations assumed no obligation. A promise relates to the future, and this promise was not given on any assumed condition hereafter to be performed by them. The blessing of the promise was not in them nor conditioned on what they would be in meeting compact terms. It was in Christ, and on the condition of what He would do. In saying that there is no mediator in a promise to men given freely by

one party alone, it is not said that there is no grace-covenant whose benefits Christ mediates to men. That covenant does have parties to it. But man is not one of the parties, for in a strict sense it was not made with Abraham, but only the promise of its blessings given to him. The parties to the grace-covenant were the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and it was made in eternity before the world was, and each of these parties had stipulations to perform in behalf of men who were to receive the blessings of the covenant, the Father to give His only begotten Son to become the sinner's substitute in death and judgment, and then to give Him a spiritual seed, the Son to do the Father's will in an assumed nature, in obedience unto death on the cross, and the Spirit to apply the vicarious sacrifice of the Son and to regenerate and sanctify those to whom the application is made. And from this eternal covenant, arise in eternity election and predestination, calling, justification, and regeneration on earth, and glorification in eternity after the Lord's final advent. I say this covenant was not made with Abraham, but the promise of its blessings was made to him; made to him, however, in his one promised seed, even Christ. The law-covenant was temporary; it was only, as the text says, to last until the promised seed comes; it was transitory. The law-covenant, because inferior, was given through the disposition of angels. It was subsidiary. I use the word, "subsidiary." I will show what I mean. Our text says that the law-covenant, 430 years after the promise, was superadded. What is meant by "superadded?" It was added to something that went before. What is it that went before? The grace-covenant and the promise of the grace-covenant. The law-covenant did not come in to annul what preceded it, but it came in to be subsidiary to what preceded.

We come now to one of the greatest questions in the Bible, and Paul raises it squarely, "What then is the law?" Or as King James' version reads, "Wherefore then serveth

the law?" If the law does not annul the grace-covenant or its promise, what is it for? A man is a theologian who can answer that question scripturally. Here I give some scriptures to study and which must be interpreted before one can answer the question, "What then is the law?" I answer first negatively. Our text says it was not given as a law by which life could come. If we think a moment we see why; these people were sinners, already under condemnation. How could any attempt on their part to keep the law in the future bring them life? Suppose the sinner should say, "I want to obtain life from the law," and the law should put on its spectacles and say, "Were you born holy, or did you start right?" That question knocks him out at the start. If there was not anything else, he is gone. In Romans we see how Paul elaborates this. Our case was settled before we were born. Suppose we waive this question of starting right, can we perfectly keep this law? Let us assume that we say, "Yes." Now, what part of our life is absolutely perfect? If we are guilty of one point, we are guilty of all. If we should obey the law perfectly thirty years and then fail on one point we are gone. "What then is the law?" or "Why the law?" It certainly was not intended to confer life. And it was not intended to bring us the Holy Spirit, for I have already proven in the beginning of the chapter that the Spirit was received by the hearing of faith. Take the great blessing—forgiveness of sins and justification—was the law intended as the way of justification? It was not intended as a way of life; it was not intended to justify, for "By the works of the law shall no flesh in thy sight be justified." What then is the law? Here are the scriptures to be read: Galatians 3 and 4; Romans 7:1-14; 5:20; 3:31; 4:15; II Cor. 3:6-9. When one can expound these scriptures he can answer the question, "What then is the law, or why the law?" What purpose does it serve? Paul says it was superadded to the grace-covenant and subsidiary

to the promise. Why was it added? *Because of transgressions.* But what the import of this reason?

The object of the law is not to prevent sin, but to discover sin. It is a standard of right-living, but it is not a way of life.

A man is a sinner and does not seem to know it. In order to serve a certain purpose of the grace-covenant, the law must be superadded. Let us hold this standard right up before the man's life, and whenever the life does not conform he is shown to be lawless. What is the purpose? *To discover sin.* I am sure we cannot get the man into the grace-covenant, who has not discovered sin. Again, the law was given to provoke to sin, to make sin abound, to provoke it to a development of all its potentiality, that sin may be seen as exceedingly sinful. So that the standard of the law not merely discovers sin, but by provocation develops it to its utmost expression. Sin must be made to appear exceedingly sinful. If we want to find what is in a boy, let us pass a law that he should not stand on top of a pole on one foot, and we shall see the boys climbing that pole and doing that very thing. It shows the lawless spirit that is in a child, even now. We thus see how law is subsidiary to the grace-covenant, because one must realize sinfulness before we can bring him in touch with the promise of grace. Again, it is the object of the law to condemn and not to justify. Justification is the opposite of condemnation. If a man doesn't feel that he is condemned, why should he seek to be justified? A great many people are quite sure that they are not under condemnation and therefore they do not need to be justified by the hearing of faith. What else? The law was added for wrath, to reveal the penalty of the sin. The law was added to gender bondage and death, to make a man see that he is a slave and doomed to death. The subsidiary nature of the law appears again in this expression of the context: "The law is a pedagogue

unto Christ." What is a pedagogue? Let us get back to the etymology of the word. The Greek word "pedagogue" originally did not mean a school-master, but meant the slave that carried the little boy to the school that the teacher might teach him. The law does not teach a man the way of life, but it is the pedagogue—the slave—in whose charge he puts his little son before that son is grown, and the duty of that slave is to accompany that little boy to school. Why? If there were not somebody along the little boy might play truant and go fishing or hunting. This slave's business was not to teach; it was to take him to the school where the teacher was to teach him. Now, says Paul, the law was intended to be our pedagogue to Christ. So we see the point and force of the "superadded." The law is subsidiary; it does no saving itself, but it brings the sinner to one who can do something for him. An old preacher said, "When I find a perfectly hardened sinner that thinks he can stand on his own record I take him to Mt. Sinai and turn him over to it, smoking and thundering and let the hell-scare get him, and when that hell-scare gets him he will look out for relief. He will know that he is a sinner." The law is a pedagogue unto Christ. An old Presbyterian preacher once said that he sent Moses after a sinner, and by the time Moses knocked him down a time or two he would be ready to take the Savior.

QUESTIONS

1. Expound Gal. 3: 15, "though it be but a man's covenant, etc.," showing (1) The requirements of a man's covenant. (2) The extent of their application. (3) The disgrace attached to a covenant breaker. (4) From what the brand of infamy on a covenant breaker derives its odium. (5) N. T. examples of covenants so regarded. (6) The reproach cast upon the Carthaginians. (7) Luther's mistake. (8) The nature of Paul's argument in this verse.

2. Give the force of Paul's argument under the following heads: (1) The difference of time. (2) The "seed" of the promise. (3) The "all nations" versus one nation. (4) The condition of inheritance. (5) The promise confirmed—when? (6) The purpose of the

promise. (7) The nature of the inheritance. (8) The mediator of the covenant versus no mediator of the promise, expounding particularly verses 17, 18, 19 and 20.

3. In saying that there is no mediator in a *promise* to man given freely by one party alone, what is not said?

4. Who is the mediator of the grace-covenant, who its parties, when made, and what the stipulations? From this covenant what great doctrines arise, (1) in eternity, (2) in time, (3) in eternity after the Lords advent?

5. What, then, Abraham's relation to it?

6. What the argument based upon the fact that the law covenant was given by the disposition of angels?

7. How long was the law-covenant to last?

8. Wherefore, then, the law, under the following heads: (1) What scriptures to be studied here? (2) Meaning of "superadded" —added to what? (3) Why added? (4) How does the law (a) discover sin, (b) provoke to sin, (c) condemn sin, (d) gender to bondage and death, (e) reveal wrath or penalty?

9. How is the law a pedagogue unto Christ?

V

INDUCTION INTO CHRIST

Scripture: Gal. 3:23—4:20

WHILE in the last discussion we anticipated somewhat by dipping a little into Gal. 4, I commence this chapter at 3:23: "But before faith came, we were kept in ward under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." The part of that verse that needs explanation is the word, "faith." Faith is used in the following senses:

1. The act, or exercise, of believing in Christ. That is not what is meant by the word here, because the Old Testament people, looking through the types, believed in Christ and had witness borne to their faith, as we learn from Hebrews 11. Therefore the error was radical when a Baptist preacher said that there was no faith in Christ until after Christ came and died, and no forgiveness of sins. And not only did I hear a Baptist preacher say that, but I heard a Campbellite preacher misapply it in the same way, saying there could be no remission of sins until Christ actually died, and then the sins of the Old Testament saints were remitted. But sins were remitted in Old Testament times on God's acceptance of what the Surety would do at the proper time. We must not confound expiation and remission. I will give a financial illustration. Paul writes to Philemon: "If Onesimus oweth thee aught, put that to mine account." The very moment that Philemon charged it to Paul he could no longer hold it against Onesimus. It was remitted to Onesimus. The surety was held, and not the original contractor of the debt. It stood remitted against

Onesimus, since it was put to Paul's account. The debt was not actually paid to the creditor. Only the personal responsibility for the debt was changed. It was paid whenever Paul should pay it later. Just so God was in the world in Old Testament times not reckoning, or charging, or imputing their sins to them, but was charging them to Christ and reckoning them to Christ, and so sins were remitted just as freely in the Old Testament times as in the New Testament times, but the actual expiation was not made until Christ died. I quote from the "Philadelphia Confession of Faith" the following:

Art. VIII, Sec. 6: "Although the price of redemption was not actually paid by Christ until after His incarnation, yet the virtue, efficacy and benefit thereof was communicated to the elect in all ages successively from the beginning of the world, etc."

Again Art. XI, Sec. 6: "The justification of believers under the Old Testament was *in all these respects,* one and the same with the justification of believers under the New Testament." And what is more authoritative than any confession of faith is the testimony of God's Word in Rom. 4:7 and II Cor. 5:19. Nevertheless one should either subscribe to the confession of his denomination on vital points or quit the denomination.

2. Faith sometimes means the body, or system, of gospel truths, usually preceded by the article, "the." But evidently that cannot be the meaning here. In what sense then is "faith" used in Gal. 3:23? Here is the reading which supplies the modifying words: "But before the object of faith came we were kept in ward under the law." The object of faith is Christ, the antitype. The simple meaning of the whole section is, that an Old Testament believer, though his sins were remitted and he was justified, must yet observe the law of types until Christ came. Just as in chapter 4 it says, "But I say that so long as the heir

is a child, he differeth nothing from a bondservant, though he is Lord of all; but is under guardians and stewards until the day appointed of the father." Being shut up under the law meant that the Old Testament saint, though his sins were remitted by faith in the antitype, yet had to keep on fulfilling the requirements of the law as to feasts and ceremonies and the observance of days. He was in the position of an heir but had not yet obtained his majority, but had to keep up the type until the antitype came. We need to get that meaning clear in our mind, because in the New Testament an argument is based on it. We have Moses who had real faith, and David and Enoch and Elijah, who had real faith, but they kept up the ceremonial law. The form was symbolic in the Mosaic law, and in the law preceding Moses. Why do we not now do as did the early people? Because the object of faith came, and the heirs of faith are now out from under the law. We are not under stewards and governors as the Old Testament people were. I spent an hour trying to get a Baptist preacher straight on this passage in Galatians, and I am sure I convinced him.

I now explain the next verse: "So that the law has become our tutor to bring us unto Christ." The Greek word is compound, *pais,* a child, and *agogos,* a conductor. *Agogos* is from the verb, *agein,* to lead, or conduct. To complete the analogy we have only to refer to the heathen custom of entrusting the care of a child in his nonage, to a slave. This slave was not necessarily the teacher, in the modern sense of pedagogue, but would lead the child to the school where the real teacher would instruct him. So the law, a slave, leads to Christ, the great teacher. In this sense the law evidently was not to annul the previous covenant of grace, but was added to it in a subsidiary or helpful sense. But now that the object of faith is come, we are no longer under the tutor. In many places Paul thus argues against any

lapsing into Judaism. It was going back to the rudiments, the weak and beggarly elements of an obsolete dispensation. The whole book of Hebrews is written on that subject.

So a man who observes the seventh day instead of the first day proclaims that he is still in the Old Testament.

We come now to a thought not discussed before, verse 26: "For ye are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus." The Jews, as Jews, were not sons by faith, but sons by lineal, fleshly descent. "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." What is the force of "baptized into Christ?"

I had a Campbellite brother say to me,

"You Baptists have no method of induction into Christ." I said,

"What is your method?" He said,

"We baptize into Christ," Then I said,

"How will you reply to the Roman Catholic when he says you Campbellites have no method of inducting Christ into you? You ask them how they induct Christ into men and they answer, 'By eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Jesus Christ in the mass.'"

I reply to both, for the Catholic has better ground than the Campbellite—that each ordinance is a symbolic, pictorial induction. Baptism does not really put us into Christ. On the contrary, says Paul, "By faith we enter into this grace wherein we stand." Eating the bread and drinking the wine does not really put Christ into us, for by the Spirit Christ is put into us, or "formed in us the hope of glory." (See also II Cor. 3:18 and 4:6.) Baptism does not really put us into Christ; it is only figurative of it. Paul says, "By faith we are all children of God." By faith, and not by baptism, so that the form of being baptized into Christ is not the reality of putting us into Christ. In baptism we put on Christ, as an enlisted soldier puts on the uniform which is the external emblem, or symbol, of his enlistment.

The next verse calls for some explanation. "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus." What are the distinctions between the two covenants? Under the Mosaic covenant a Jew only belonging to the nation by fleshly descent was in the covenant. But in the new covenant it is neither Jew nor Greek. There is no distinction of nationality. That is the first point. They all come in just alike, as the animals went into the ark through one door. There was just one door; the eagle had to swoop down and go in the same door that the snail crawled through.

The second point of distinction is not national, but in Christ there is no distinction between a slave and his master. Abraham's slaves were circumcised because they belonged to him. But in the new covenant the slaves of a believer are not baptized because they belong to him. Neither the relation of children nor slaves put them in the covenant and entitles them to the ordinances. Earthly relations do not count at all in the new covenant. Here the individual alone counts. The child of a preacher must himself repent and believe and must be baptized for himself. The preacher's wife must repent and believe and be baptized for herself. She must take no religious step because of her relation to her husband, such as joining "his church" to be with him or in order to "commune with him." This passage means even more than that. In the old covenant only the males received the token of the covenant. In the new covenant there is no distinction as to ordinances between male and female. The woman is baptized as well as the man. If one was a slave of a Jew, the law required that the slave should be circumcised, becoming a member of the covenant through circumcision. Under the new covenant, it is clearly said that there is neither bond nor free—that a slave does not come in because he is a slave belonging to some one

in the covenant, but comes in on his own personal faith in Christ, just as any other sinner comes in.

I repeat that the next point of difference in that verse is one of sex. Under the Jewish covenant only the male received the token of the covenant. The woman's position in the Mosaic covenant was a very subordinate one, but in the new covenant the woman receives the ordinance of the covenant just the same as the man. She is a human being and comes in by her own personal faith in Christ, and is received by baptism just the same as if she were a man. So we see that makes a very important distinction in the two covenants.

Verse 29 needs just a word of explanation: "And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise," whether a heathen, a Jew, a Scythian, Bohemian, a man or a woman. If one gets into Christ by faith then he belongs to Abraham's seed—not his fleshly seed, but his spiritual seed, as Paul says, "He is not a Jew who is one outwardly, but he is a Jew who is one inwardly." The real circumcision is not the circumcision of the flesh, but of the heart. He is repeating what I have explained before: "But I say that so long as the heir is a child, he differeth nothing from a bondservant though he is lord of all; but is under guardians and stewards until the day appointed of the father." So the Old Testament saints as children were held in bondage under the rudiments of the world, that is, bound to observe those ceremonial laws of sacrifice and the entire sabbatic cycle. "But when the fullness of time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that He might redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." We are not children of God by ordinary generation. We are children of God by regeneration. When born naturally I was not in the kingdom, not in the church, not in anything religious, yet some denominations teach that the church consists of believers and their children. We don't get in because we are

the sons of some member that is in, or the slave, or the wife of somebody that is in—we do not get in that way. We come in by adoption. What is adoption? Adoption is that process of law by which one, not naturally a member of the family, is legally made a member and an heir of the family. Naturally we do not belong to God's family. We could not call God father.

Now comes a point more precious than any I have presented, 4:16: "And because ye are sons [by adoption, by regeneration], God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father."

I remember as distinctly as I can remember anything that ever came in my experience, the day, the place and the hour when in my heart I could say for the first time, to God, "Father;" when the realization of God's fatherhood and when the filial feeling toward God came into my soul. That was when I accepted Christ.

There was nothing in the old covenant that gave one that individual assurance, that inward witness. It could not, as it came by natural descent, but here is a very precious thing in the new covenant that to all those who by faith enter into this covenant, there is given a witness: "God's Spirit witnesseth with our spirit that we are the children of God." The filial feeling comes to us. The first time I preached on that subject I used this illustration: If I were to go to spend a night with one of the neighbors and, not knowing his children personally, would see the children come in from school, I could tell by watching them which ones were the children of that home and which were the neighbor's children, without asking any questions. The real child of the house has perfect freedom. There is no form nor stilts. The little girls just run right up to their mamma and say, "Give me this," or "give me that," but the neighbor's child is more ceremonious in making requests and taking familiar liberties, because there is no filial feeling. An or-

ST. JOHN'S BAPTIST [illegible]
Hawthorne Lane and Fifth Street

phan received into a home, after having been legally adopted, will at first be shy and distant. Only when by long usage the child begins to exercise the filial feeling does he feel that he belongs there. When in such case that filial feeling begins to appear in the child there is something that somewhat answers to the Spirit's witness to our spirits that we are children of God and may say, "Father."

As a sinner I thought of God often, that is, His holiness, His justness and His omnipotence, and the thought was more terrifying than pleasant, but as a Christian there is nothing sweeter in the heart than when I think of God as father. It is the sweetest thought I ever had—"our Father." He is no longer dreadful to me nor distant, but the filial feeling in my heart toward God gives me a freedom of approach to Him. I count that one of the most precious blessings of the new covenant.

To continue: "So that thou art no longer a bondservant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through God. Howbeit at that time, not knowing God, ye were in bondage to them that by nature are no gods [ye were idolators]: but now that ye have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, how turn ye back again to the weak and beggarly rudiments, whereunto ye desire to be in bondage over again?" We can understand how a slave should want to step out of bondage into the privileges of sonship and heirship, but it is more difficult to understand that a son and heir should desire to go back to the position of bondage.

I heard a Baptist preacher once say that repentance is "to know God." I told him that it was much more important for God to know us than for us to know God; that our title to heaven did not consist of our being sure that we knew God, but in being sure that God knew us; that many in the last day would say, "Lord, Lord, open unto us; we have prophesied in thy name," but He will say, "You claim to know me, but I never knew you."

A passage in Paul's Letter to Timothy is much in point just here. The apostle is describing how some who once claimed to know God had made shipwreck of the faith. He rebukes the idea of our standing in God's sight by what we know, or claim, by describing the seal of a true Christian. This seal bears a double inscription. On one side the inscription reads: "The Lord knoweth them that are His," and on the other side the inscription reads: "Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from iniquity." This gives two real tests of one's profession: (1) Does the Lord know him to be a Christian, as Jesus says, "I know my sheep?" (2) Does he bear fruit? Does he depart from iniquity? In other words, does the sheep follow the Shepherd? The passage is II Tim. 2:19 where he rebukes the errorists, who had overthrown the faith of some, by saying, "Howbeit the firm foundation of God standeth, *having this seal,* The Lord knoweth them that are His," and, "Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness." What a theme that is for a sermon!

We may be mistaken in thinking we are Christians, but He doesn't make any mistakes. Spurgeon says, "Our title to salvation does not depend on our hold on Christ, but on His hold on us." We may shake loose our hold on Christ, but Christ doesn't turn us loose. Peter turned loose and thought he was gone, but Christ did not turn loose, so Peter was not gone. That is why he changes that expression, "Rather to be known of God."

I was attending a meeting in Burleson County conducted by our Methodist friends (and they do hold some mighty good meetings), and a great many penitents were forward.

"Come into the altar and help those laboring souls," a brother said.

So I went and sat down by a man that was crying and groaning, and I said,

"My brother, what are you crying about?" He says,

"Well, I have been converted a dozen times and I always fall, and now I have fallen again." I said,

"Perhaps you are mistaken on one or the other of these points."

"No, sir; I know I am not mistaken; I know I was converted and now I have lost it." I said,

"Then what are you crying about? Tears are quite useless in such a case."

"What do you mean?" he asked. I replied,

"On your statement your case is hopeless according to this scripture: 'For as touching those that were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come, and then fell away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance.'" Then I said,

"You see, my friend, why this is so. I can neither help you nor comfort you in any way until you can give up one or the other of your positive assertions. You are making your fallible knowledge of two vital points the standard. What have I or any other preacher to present to you? If I present Christ as the only name whereby one can be saved, you say you have tried Him and He failed. If I present faith as the only means of laying hold on Christ, you say you have tried that and it failed. If I present the Holy Spirit as the only one who can apply Christ's blood and regenerate and sanctify you, you say you have tried Him on all these points and He failed. I am sure I have nothing more to offer you. The only three-ply rope that can lift you to heaven you say has been broken in all its strands in your case; so there is nothing left for you but to get ready for hell." He quit crying at once and said,

"Maybe I was mistaken on one of those points." I replied,

"Just so, and the sooner you can determine on which one the sooner I can direct you what to do. If on the first point, then seek a salvation you never had, just as any other sinner. If on the second point only, then seek healing as a backslider."

Verse 10: "Ye observe days, and months, and seasons, and years." That is an unmistakable reference to the sabbatical days of the Old Testament economy—their seventh day Sabbath, their lunar Sabbath, their annual Sabbaths and their jubilee Sabbath, which means that one so doing prefers the Old Testament economy to the New. Compare his strong teaching on this point in his Letter to the Colossians—Col. 2:20-23.

Verse 11: "I am afraid of you, lest by any means I have bestowed labor upon you in vain." Here he questions not himself, nor what he preached, but fears that their profession was empty and vain. For if they had truly accepted Christ, why should they leave the substance for the shadow, thus practically saying that Christ had not come yet?

In verse 15 we note a question: "Where then is that gratulation of yourselves?" (Amer. Standard). "Where then the blessedness ye spake of?" (Common Version). The point of the question is this: They counted themselves as so great beneficiaries of Paul in the first meeting that he to them was an angel from heaven, and their gratitude so great they were ready to pluck out their own eyes to give to him; it was marvelous that all this had so rapidly passed away, and a contrary attitude assumed toward him. It called for an adequate explanation which must be sought on supernatural grounds or the intervention of a bewitching power. Mere fickleness of mind on their part, since he hadn't changed, could not explain. Let the reader compare the prophet's address to Ephraim and Judah (Hos. 6:4), and point out the expression in the famous hymn, "O, for

a closer walk with God," based on the common version rendering of this verse.

We note another piercing question in verse 16: "Am I become your enemy, by telling you the truth?"

Many years ago I read an account of two visits of Henry Clay to Lexington, Kentucky. He was very popular in Kentucky. On one occasion the whole town turned out to welcome him. Houses were covered with banners, bands were playing "Behold the Conquering Hero Comes." Later he made a second visit to that town and they greeted him with rotten eggs.

What had changed them? Clay had not changed. A very beautiful incident occurred on that last visit. Among the crowd that was against him on the last visit was an old mountaineer, a hunter, with his long Kentucky rifle in his hand, who came up and said, "Mr. Clay, it breaks my heart to tell you. I have been standing by you all my life, but that last vote of yours in Congress has turned me, and I have to go back on you." Clay looked at him and reached out and took hold of his gun, saying, "Is this a good old Kentucky rifle?" "Yes, sir; never a better." "Has it never happened when you were out hunting because there was no meat in the house, that you saw a big buck in easy range, and lo! your gun snapped?" "Yes, sir; it has happened." "What did you do—throw away the gun, or pick the flint and try it again?" The old hunter said, "I see the point; I'll pick the flint and try you again."

In verse 17 Paul lays bare the motive of the authors of this sudden change: "They zealously seek you in no good way; nay, they desire to shut you out, that ye may seek them." Their object was to shut out their credulous victims from Paul that they might be sought as teachers themselves.

We come to two verses that need a little explanation: "My little children, of whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you"—then he stops and never does

finish the sentence. There is a dash there showing that his own mind is in doubt as to whether they were false professors or backsliders. "But I could wish to be present with you now, and to change my tone; for I am perplexed about you." He did not know just how to treat them—whether to present a personal Christ to them as to those never having had any real faith, or whether to try to bring them back as backsliders. He could not tell what was in their hearts. He could not read them. "I am perplexed." "If I just knew your real state, I would know how to talk to you; if, like God, I could know whether you are Christians or not I would know what to say to you." So all preachers in their experience have that perplexity of mind when dealing with some people.

QUESTIONS

1. What is the meaning of faith in 3:23?
2. Give several meanings of the word, "faith."
3. Illustrate a misinterpretation of faith in this verse.
4. Give the financial illustration of how Old Testament saints were justified.
5. Why did they keep up the ceremonial law, and why do we not keep it?
6. Explain the law as a pedagogue unto Christ.
7. What is the force of "baptized unto Christ?" Give the position of the Campbellites, Catholics and Baptists on this point.
8. What are the distinctions between the two covenants—(1) As to nationality? (2) As to slaves and their masters? (3) As to sex?
9. What is adoption, and upon what is this legal process based?
10. How is the fatherhood of God realized? Give the author's illustration.
11. What is the result. (See 4:6, 7.)
12. What is the difference between knowing God and being known of God, which the more important, and why?
13. What inscriptions on the Christian's seal?
14. What is the reference in 4:10, "Ye observe days, months, etc.," and what Paul's teaching on this in Col. 2:20-23?
15. Contrast their present attitude toward Paul with their former attitude, and illustrate.
16. Compare the prophet's address to Ephraim and Judah, and point out the expression in "Oh, for a closer walk with God," based on the common version rendering of 4:15.
17. What the motive of the authors of this sudden change?
18. What doubt is indicated by the dash in verse 19, and what the perplexity indicated by it?

VI

THE TWO COVENANTS

Scriptures: Gal. 4:21—5:12

THIS discussion commences at Gal. 4:21, and we note first the distinct paragraphs in what remains in this letter. From verse 21, where we commence, to the end of verse 1 of chapter 5 is a distinct paragraph. That chapter division is very unfortunate. Chapter 5 should commence at verse 2. The next paragraph is from verses 2 to 6, inclusive. There the most of the argument of the book ends, though he takes up an argument after that. The next paragraph is from 5:7-12. The next paragraph commences at 5:13 and goes to the end of the chapter. The next paragraph takes in the first ten verses of chapter 6. Then we have the closing paragraph. It would be well if, instead of chapters and verses, the book had been divided on the paragraph plan as I have suggested, and as we would find if we were studying it in the Greek.

I call attention to some textual matters: Verse 31 of chapter 4 and verse 1 of chapter 5, ought to be really just one verse, and it is an exceedingly difficult matter, according to the manuscripts, to tell just how that verse should stand as to its parts. The oldest manuscripts are followed in the American Standard Revision. Lightfoot insists that we should read those two verses this way: "Wherefore, brethren, we are not children of a handmaid [or bond woman] but of a freewoman in the liberty with which Christ has made us free; therefore stand and be not entangled again in the yoke of bondage." That is the way Lightfoot would read it. It is just a question of the manu-

script about the position of the words. The Revised Standard Version follows the best manuscripts, making it read just as we have it here, only it is not all one verse: "Wherefore, brethren, we are not children of a handmaid, but of the freewoman. For freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage." I would call attention to a great many others of that kind if we were studying the Greek. Verse 25 of chapter 4, in the Standard Revision reads: "Now this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to the Jerusalem that now is: for she is in bondage with her children." Some manuscripts make that read: "Sinai is a mountain in Arabia." I don't agree with those manuscripts at all. Everybody knows that Sinai is a mountain in Arabia, and the Revised Version follows the best texts in that.

We will now take up the exposition of 4:21: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do you not hear the law?" I call attention to the fact that what the law here says does not occur in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers or Deuteronomy, but it occurs in Genesis, and the point about it is this, that the New Testament as well as the Old Testament, calls the history in the Pentateuch law, as well as the legislation itself. The history is the background of the statutes—the whole of it. History and legislation is called the law. If we get that clear in our minds it will save us from the mistakes of the radical critics. Whether it be history in Genesis or legislation on Mt. Sinai, it is called the law.

Verse 22: "It is written that Abraham had two sons." He says the law (which is in Genesis) tells us that there was one by a handmaid and one by a freewoman. The next verse shows us the distinction between the births of those children. The son of the handmaid is born after the flesh—a perfectly natural birth. The son of the freewoman is born through promise. The birth of Isaac was just as supernatural as any miracle can be. There were no powers

of nature in either Abraham or Sarah to bring about the birth of Isaac. It was supernatural. Now that is what the scripture says. Paul expounds that scripture in order to show that the Old Testament history is itself prophetic—that it has more than a literal, historical sense. It has that, but it has more. He says, "Which things contain an allegory." That part of the history of Genesis, besides its literal meaning, contains an allegory. Here the radical critics object to what they say is a strained interpretation that Paul puts upon plain history, and they say that he gets his allegory from Philo, an Alexandrian Jew, or he follows the rabbis in allegorizing the history of the Jewish people. Did Paul get the idea of the allegorical significance in that history from Philo the Jew, or from the rabbis, and if from neither, where did he get it? It is true that Philo did allegorize, but his allegories and Paul's are poles apart as we see if we put them down and read them together as I have done many times. In the second place, Paul did not get the idea from what the Rabbis had said, but he got it from the O. T., and particularly, from the Book of Isaiah. The Book of Isaiah consists of two parts. Chapters 1-40 relate to one thing, and the rest of it relates to spiritual Israel, and it is called the O. T. Book of Comfort. And whenever Isaiah, from chapter 40 on, speaks of Israel, he is referring to spiritual Israel. For instance, in chapter 51 he refers to Abraham and Sarah, and then in chapter 54 he uses the language that Paul cites here in the context, showing that Sarah occupied a representative and allegorical position in his mind, and the quotation is specified here: "Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child: for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife." That is Isaiah's use of it in which he is addressing Sarah as representing the motherhood of spiritual Israel, and she that hath been barren is

called desolate; because no children have been born to her, she is called more desolate than Hagar. So Paul gets his theory from the inspired people; he simply follows the history when he says, "that scripture contains an allegory."

Let us now see what the allegory contained. These women are two covenants. As, in the dream of Pharaoh, the seven lean kine are seven years of famine, Pharaoh uses the verb, "are" in the sense of "represent," *i. e.*, the seven lean kine *represent* seven years of famine. And as where our Savior says, "this is my body," that is, "this unleavened bread *represents* my body." He is showing what the allegory represents—that those two women represent two covenants—one from Mt. Sinai bearing children into bondage which is Hagar. The Hagar woman represents, allegorically, the Mt. Sinai covenant. He goes on to say in the next verse that Hagar, that is, this allegorical Hagar that he is speaking about, is Mt. Sinai in Arabia and answereth to the Jerusalem that now is and is in bondage with her children. Sarah represents the Jerusalem, not the Jerusalem that now is, but the Jerusalem which is above that is our mother. We, the children of the freewoman, represent the Jerusalem which is above. It is necessary to make clear the meaning of Jerusalem above as contra-distinct from the Jerusalem on earth. In Hebrews, 12:18ff., distinguishing between the two covenants, the two regimes, this language is used: "For ye are not come unto a mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, and into blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which voice they that heard entreated that no word more should be spoken unto them; * * * and so fearful was the appearance, that Moses said, "I exceedingly fear and quake." In other words, "Ye Christians are not under the Mt. Sinai regime, but ye are come unto Mount Zion, * * * the heavenly Jerusalem." That is the Jerusalem above, or in the place of "heavenly" we may use

"spiritual." We are not come to the literal mountain in Arabia, nor are we come to the literal Jerusalem situated over yonder in the Holy Land, but to the spiritual Jerusalem. How many of our hymns are written with that idea! In Revelation that thought is elaborated about the spiritual Israel, the spiritual city, Rev. 3:12: "He that overcometh I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go out hence no more, etc.," and in the closing part of Revelation, "I saw the New Jerusalem come down out of heaven." In view of this, I point out the folly of the crusades, preached by Peter the Hermit and encouraged by subsequent popes. The object of the crusades was to rescue the Holy Jerusalem from infidels—that Jerusalem which has lost its value. They were to rescue the empty tomb of Jesus. The crusades did an immense amount of good, but there never was a more profound piece of folly than to think it was necessary to rescue the city under the curse of God, with an empty tomb in it, as a religious duty.

We will go on with our allegory: "For it was written." Here he quotes that passage in Isaiah 54, and here is his conclusion from the allegory in verse 28: "Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are children of promise"—*i. e.*, supernaturally born, regenerated—"but as then he that was born after the flesh [Ishmael] persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, so also it is now." The literal Jerusalem and the Judaizing spirit will persecute the spiritual Israel. Just as Ishmael did, so will the Jews do now. Verse 30: "Howbeit what saith the scripture?" Notice then that the scripture is again personified. The words, *ta hiera grammata* refer to the whole collection of scriptures; every one of those scriptures is God-inspired. So Paul takes a part of the history in Genesis and says, "The scripture saith."

I am giving this to show the folly of the people who say, "The book contains the word of God, but not all of it is

the word of God." Well, what did the scripture say? "Cast out the handmaid and her son: for the son of the handmaid shall not inherit with the son of the freewoman." Sarah used these words to Abraham: "This bond-slave child should not inherit with my child; cast her out and her son." It grieved Abraham until God spoke to him and endorsed what Sarah said, God having in mind not only what was best for them at that time, but having in mind the allegorical meaning of those two women.

Here is an important matter: The ablest debater that I ever read after was the great Presbyterian, N. L. Rice, and here let the reader note just what Rice said about the covenant and how the covenant puts the infants in the church. A certain man was once quoting Rice to me on that and he said, "The O. T. put the children in with the parents, and now if it put them in, how are you going to put them out?" I said, "Here is the passage, 'Cast out the bondwoman and her son.'" That casts the covenant out and infant membership. It is true that the children come in in the new covenant; it is true that we baptize every child in the new covenant, but he is a regenerated child—a spiritual child—and nobody in the world can answer that. And yet I never heard a Pedo-baptist make an argument that he did not bring in the relation that the children bore to the old covenant, viz.: that they were in the covenant. That is their first and, indeed, their only respectable argument.

A certain Baptist wrote a book with this title: "Baptists the only Pedo-baptists," *i. e.*, the Baptists are the only denomination that really baptize children. They baptize every spiritual child if he is only converted, and if his spiritual childhood is only an hour old. The Baptists baptize him, and the others don't do that; they baptize the goats—those that are not children. He makes a very fine argument, and if we just understand him, he is hitting the nail on the head. The Baptists don't baptize anything but children, but they

belong to spiritual Israel, and they often baptize them the very day they are new born. They don't wait eight days.

Let us now consider those joined verses of chapters 4 and 5: "Wherefore, brethren, we are not children of a handmaid, but of the freewoman. For freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage." Where does Christ himself discuss that just as Paul does? It is very important to see that Christ and Paul are in agreement in that very matter. John 8:31: "Jesus therefore said to those Jews that had believed Him, if ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. They answered unto Him, We are Abraham's seed, and have never yet been in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free? Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Every one that committeth sin is the bondservant of sin. And the bondservant abideth not in the house forever; the Son abideth forever. If therefore the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed. I know that ye are Abraham's seed [that is, the fleshly seed]; yet ye seek to kill me, because my word hath not free course in you." Verse 39: "They answered and said unto Him, Our father is Abraham. Jesus sayeth unto them, If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham. But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I heard from God; this did not Abraham. Ye do the works of your father. They said unto Him, We were not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God." Verse 44: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do." Paul says, "For freedom did Christ set us free." I am showing that Christ taught precisely on the line that Paul did here in this letter to the Galatians.

I now commence chapter 5 at verse 2. This paragraph consists of the following thoughts (from the 2nd verse

to the 6th he discusses circumcision): First, he says, "If you insist on circumcision, Christ will profit you nothing. Second, if you insist on being circumcised, then you are a debtor to do the whole law. Third, if you insist on being circumcised and being a Jew in order to salvation, then you are severed from Christ; you are fallen away from grace."

A man once said to me, "Does the Bible teach falling from grace?" I said, "Yes." "Well," he says, "I thought you didn't believe in apostasy." I said, "I don't; we mean by apostasy, (1) that a man has to be regenerated and (2), that this regenerated man is finally lost. This falling from grace here does not mean that; it simply means that a man who will turn from salvation by grace to being a Jew in order to be saved, that that man is fallen from grace. The Bible does teach that he severs himself from Christ."

The next thought presented here is that "Christians through the Spirit by faith wait for the hope of righteousness." What is the hope of righteousness for which the Christian waits? He is speaking of the doctrine of justification by faith, and that doctrine by faith had a certain hope in it. And what is the hope? The hope includes everything that is involved in the final coming of the Lord to give the crowning glories to those that are justified by faith; it has a hope that refers to the future. That hope is, If my name is written in the Lamb's book of life, it not only stands secure, but it will bring everything else that it has promised, as "whom He justified, them He also glorified."

The next thought is, that "in Christ neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth anything." We don't get into Christ because we are circumcised, and we don't get into Christ because we are not circumcised. We get in on an entirely different term, as the next thought shows, "faith working by love." The Roman Catholics teach certain doctrines based on this verse, "Faith worketh by love," that is, they say that "worketh" should be translated "wrought."

Therefore, the Catholics have a doctrine that they call *fides caritate formosa,* "Faith made by love," that is their special doctrine based on that verse. But the verb is not in the passive voice. It isn't "being worked;" it is *the doing, the working.* And this leads me to another observation that when Paul talks about faith working by love he bridges an apparent chasm between him and James. James, in his letter, says that the faith that is apart from energy, or work, is dead. Paul says that the faith that justifies is the faith with energy; it works by love. As that passage bridges the apparent chasm, there is no discrepancy between Paul and James. Practically the argument closes here, but he brings up some argument later.

The next paragraph commences at verse 7 and ends at 13: "Ye were running well; who hindered you?" Let us consider that as it is in the Greek; the idea is that of a foot-race. The foot-race is along a prescribed or prepared track. Here is a man running on that prepared track, and suddenly he comes to a place where the track is all broken up. The word "hindered" means "a broken-up track." "You were running well? Who broke up the track? He who started you would not break up the track ahead of you; if that track is broken up, the enemy did it."

The next thought in this paragraph is that they seemed to have said that if they had gone astray it was a small matter, and he is answering that when he said, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." "You think the wedge is little, but that wedge will split the whole log. It is a vital and fundamental thing."

The next thought is the distinction which Paul makes between the Galatians and the one that side-tracked them. He says, "Now, brethren, I am confident that you will come to my way of thinking about this. I don't think that about the one that is misleading you." There he mentions them in the singular for the first time. "Whoever broke up that

road will have to bear his penalty and will have to pay the penalty of what he has done."

The next thought is that he seems to reply again to an accusation that they had made saying, "Why does he object to our views of circumcision? I am told that he circumcised Timothy and preached circumcision himself." He answers that: "If indeed I preached circumcision as you are preaching it, *i. e.*, if I am on a line with them, why am I persecuted?" Then he said, "If I presented it to you as they do I would take away the stumbling block of the cross and there would be no issue between me and these men who are misleading you." "The Jews find the cross a stumbling block," says Paul in his Letter to the Corinthians. He says here, "I would that they that unsettle you would even go beyond circumcision." What does he mean by that? The thought is this: "You are insisting upon the physical mutilation of the body; now why not go to the whole length like the idolators that were among you?" They mutilated themselves, cut their bodies with knives. "If you are going to insist on this use of the knife, why not take it to that extreme?"

QUESTIONS

1. What does the law of 4:21 say, where is it found, and what bearing has this on the meaning of the word, "law," as used in the Old and New Testaments?

2. Explain the allegory in 4:21—5:1 from these standpoints: (1) Where did Paul get the idea of this allegory, and what the evidence? (2) Ishmael and Isaac. (3) Hagar and Sarah. (4) Jerusalem that now is and the Jerusalem above. (5) Show the parallel in the two covenants. (6) Give the distinctions as expressed in Hebrews. (7) What the folly of the crusades? (8) What the attitude of the children of the flesh toward the children of the Spirit? (9) What argument is sometimes made for infant church-membership, and what the answer? (10) Then who the children of the handmaid and who the children of the free woman?

3. What the exhortation based upon this allegory, and where does Christ discuss this same idea?

4. What four things does Paul show are the result of their insistence on being circumcised? Explain particularly the last clause of 5:4.

5. What is the hope of righteousness for which the Christian waits?

6. Expound "but faith working through love." What the Catholic interpretation of it, and how does the true interpretation bridge the apparent chasm between Paul and James?

7. Explain verse 7: "Ye were running well; who hindered you, etc.?"

8. What is the force of "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?"

9. What distinction does Paul make between the Galatians and the one who side-tracked them?

10. What accusation does Paul seem to reply to in 5:11, what the stumbling block of the cross, and what does he mean by "beyond circumcision" in verse 12?

VII

SPECIAL WARNINGS AND TEACHINGS

Scripture: Gal. 5:13—6:18

THIS discussion commences with 5:13. Throughout the rest of this chapter there are warnings against false conclusions from the doctrines of justification by faith apart from works. The first warning is that our liberty is not to be construed or used as a license to do any kind of evil. The liberty referred to is freedom from the law, which does not mean freedom from the law as a standard, but it is freedom from the law as a way of life. This same subject comes up again for discussion in the Letter to the Romans where Paul avows that he has liberty to eat meat offered to idols since these idols are no gods to him; that personally it would not hurt him, but he said that he would refrain from it if it was harmful to other people.

One of the most infamous propositions ever made was that made by a Baptist preacher who said that when a man and a woman were engaged they could commit a sin for which they would not be held responsible. This is exactly what Paul warns against: "Ye were called for freedom; only use not your freedom for an occasion to the flesh." The Arminians and Romanists unite in denying the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith and not of works, because they say it is demoralizing in its tendencies; that a man will draw false conclusions from it; that he will use the liberty wherewith Christ made him free as a license to do evil. Just at this point Paul raises his first warning cry in the Letter to the Romans. He puts it in the form of an answer to a supposititious question. He had affirmed that

grace abounded above sin, then the questioner says, "Shall we sin the more that grace may abound still more? And in reply to that he said, "God forbid," or as he very strongly presented it in the Letter to Titus (2:12; 3:4-8).

I once heard an Antinomian (that means, *anti,* "against," *noma,* "the law"—against the law) preach. He was one who believed that a Christian is free from all law—that he is not even under the law to Christ. I had to follow him that afternoon. He took as a text Titus 3:4-7: "But when the kindness of God our Savior, and His love toward man, appeared, not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to His mercy He saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which He poured out upon us richly, through Jesus Christ our Savior; that, being justified by His grace, we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." His theme was the grace of God that bringeth salvation. That afternoon I took my text from Titus 2:11, 12: "For the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men, instructing us, to the intent that, denying godliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world." He presented the grace of God, but he presented a conclusion that the grace of God does not teach. I showed that that very grace of God that he commended so highly taught that right here in this present evil world we should live soberly and righteously and godly. He stopped at verse 7, and I read on a little: "Faithful is the saying, and concerning these things I desire that thou affirm confidently, to the end that they who have believed God may be careful to maintain good works." So I preceded his text with Titus 2:11ff., and followed it with the next verse and caught him between the upper and nether millstones and ground him to powder. Finding that he was irreformable, I never did rest satisfied until that Baptist preacher was out of the ministry.

I would not make the impression for one moment that we are not saved by grace through faith and that not of ourselves; it is the gift of God, and our works must not be associated with grace in order to our justification in God's sight, but I would teach that this doctrine of salvation by faith has this end in view, that the justified man should perform good works; that we are created unto good works. So those are the first warnings. I might select another scripture: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creation." There was an old man that he derived through Adam. In Christ there was a new man. Having shown that by the creative power of God's Spirit, we pass from the old man to the new man, he immediately adds, "put on therefore the new man in righteousness and holiness." It is easy to see as a conclusion from this salvation by grace, that we should render loving service to each other. We are children of God by faith. What then? Shall we fight? Shall we devour each other, or shall we render to each other the service of love? That Galatian church was as much noted for fighting each other as the Irishmen at a wake are said to be—a regular "killkenny cat" fight. Paul says that that is a false deduction from the doctrine he had been teaching. While on that point he used this expression, "The whole law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." What is meant there by "fulfilled?" Does it mean that if I love my neighbor that I have obeyed the commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart?" If it doesn't mean that, what does it mean? The whole law is filled up, filled full in this, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," that is, this is the last part of the summary that Moses gives. The first part is, "Love the Lord thy God, etc.," that is, we fill it full if we love our neighbor as ourselves. It is the commonest thing to hear people that want to evade duty to God say that religion consists of being honest, paying our debts,

etc. But that is not the sense of this "fulfill." It completes, fills full the other half of it that had been filled before. For instance, if it takes four pecks to make a bushel, the fourth peck fills the measure, if the other three have been put in. There is a remarkable passage misinterpreted by Alexander Campbell, viz.: I Timothy 1:5 (King James Version): "But the end of the commandment is love out of a pure heart and a good conscience and faith unfeigned." What is meant by "the end of the commandment?" When we say the end we are not denying that there is a beginning. The end of a commandment is love out of a pure heart, out of a good conscience, out of faith unfeigned. There we get the other element that shows the idea of filling up, filling full. The love that the outsider talks about is unknown in the Bible. Here it is—a love that springs from faith; faith brings a good conscience and that good conscience leads to a pure heart and a pure heart leads to love. So the end of the commandment is love out of a pure heart, out of a good conscience, out of faith unfeigned.

The third warning that he gives is that being justified by faith our walk must be in the Spirit not in the flesh. We are not justified by faith if we walk after what is fleshly and not the spiritual, and if we have drawn from the doctrine of justification by faith any such conclusion as that, then we have misinterpreted the doctrine.

He presents two kinds of fruit, as follows: "Walk in the Spirit but not in the flesh." What is it to walk in the Spirit? "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control; against such there is no law." What is the fruit of the flesh? "The works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousies, wraths, factions, divisions, parties, envyings, drunkenness, revelings, and such like." And to cap the climax he says that the man that does

these things shall never enter the kingdom of heaven. He is saying to them, "You must not make the mistake that by mere intellectual perception of doctrinal truth you have therefore exercised the faith of the gospel."

We may put it down as settled that no religion is worth a cent that does not make a man better than he was before; a son a better son, a father a better father, a mother a better mother, a daughter a better daughter.

If it doesn't produce good fruits, John the Baptist tells us that "every tree that bringeth forth not good fruit shall be hewn down and cast into the fire."

We now come to chapter 6, which is divided into two paragraphs. The first paragraph is the first ten verses, and presents a case of discipline, or a case where the man, though a Christian, has committed an offense: "Brethren, even if a man be overtaken in any trespass, ye who are spiritual, restore such a one in a spirit of gentleness; looking to thyself, lest thou also be tempted." We must not draw the conclusion that because Paul said just before, "I forewarn you that they that practice these things shall not inherit the kingdom of God," he means that to step aside once is fatal. As proof that he doesn't mean that, he supposes a case of a man that has been overtaken by a fault.

I was at a church conference once and three cases were presented, all of which claimed to be cases "overtaken in a fault." They asked my opinion and I said, "Brethren, there is such a thing as being overtaken by a fault, and there is such a thing as a man overtaking a fault; when he sees it plainly and follows it until he overtakes it then he is not overtaken in a fault. One of your cases is a case of 'overtaken by a fault,' another case the fellow overtakes the fault, and your third case is a mixture. It reminds me of a McClelland saddle. We don't know when we see it whether we are meeting it or overtaking it. It is the same in the rear as in the front."

The second thing is to harmonize verse 2 with verse 5: "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ * * * For each man shall bear his own burden." Is there any contradiction in the meaning? One case is evidently different in the meaning from the other case. What is the difference in the meaning?

The third point that he presents is this—verse 6: "But let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in "all good things." Or I will put it in plainer language: "Let the church member who is spiritually instructed contribute in money or kindness, to the one that instructs him." There are some people who are so afraid of being misunderstood—that what they preach will be assigned to a motive that they do not have, they leave it out of their preaching.

I heard a man say once, "I just simply can't preach on the money question; I will be misunderstood. If the brethren want to help me they can do it; if they don't want to help me, then it can go." Paul was just as sensitive a man as we are, and he knew that they that preached the gospel should live of the gospel. One of the principal things that the Galatians were trying to do was to stop this collection. He says, "See that ye abound in that grace as well as those other graces." I have seen Christians that could shout, "Fly abroad, thou mighty gospel," and when the contribution box was passed around they shut their eyes for fear they would see the wings with which it is to fly.

A man is sent with a message for God and the responsibility on him is not to vary one jot or tittle on that message. He ought to be able, as Paul said he was, to be free from the blood of all men because he had not shunned to declare the whole counsel of God.

They accused him of manipulating a big collection; while he did not do it himself, they said he did it through Titus. He knew these questions would arise, because those who are

evil-minded do suspect. They would suspect the Lord or the angels from heaven.

We cannot evade being suspected of evil. We are to take pains to live right, and so live that we may appear to live right, but that will not exempt us from being criticised.

I have oftentimes wondered at the goodness of this man, that he could say upon that subject what he did concerning the crowd that hated him, even the church at Ephesus. See I Tim. 6:17: "Charge them that are rich in this present world, that they be not high-minded nor have their hope set on the uncertainty of riches, but on God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy." And he charges them, "that they be ready to distribute, that they be willing to contribute." It took pluck to preach that to these people, for they were high-minded, because they were rich, but he was to present that to them as if putting them on their oath: "O rich man, in the name of Christ, I put you on your oath before God, be not high-minded but rich in good works as well as in money. Be ready to distribute as well as to make the money." Plucky man!

The next thought is in verses 7 and 8: "Be not deceived." A point upon which we might be deceived is what follows that doctrine. "Be not deceived; God is not mocked." He is not fooled. "For whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." We can't reverse the natural law, and we can't reverse the spiritual law. In both the spiritual and the natural realm there is a crop between the sowing and the harvest. If we sow weeds we cannot look for a barley crop. The crop is going to be according to the seed that we put in the ground, and let us not be deceived; we can't fool God. He applies that: "He that soweth unto his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; he that soweth unto the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life." The harvest is going to correspond with what we sow.

He advances to another thought of incalculable impor-

tance. We are justified by faith, and in view of that justification by the grace of God which teaches us not only to live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world, but also to do well, he exhorts: "Be not weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap if we faint not."

I remember once preaching from that text on an important occasion. We had just had a great meeting; hundreds of people had sturdily commenced to do right from a motive of love to God. Then they began to drop off; they got tired. "Let us not weary in well-doing."

It is that great persistence that wins, notwithstanding that it is an up-hill path; notwithstanding that we have wind and tide against us. Anybody can float down stream; a dead fish can do that, but it takes a live fish to go up stream. "Let us not be weary in well-doing." He gives the reasons: first, we shall reap; second, we shall reap in due season. We may not reap tomorrow, or next week or next year, but at the appointed season (and every seed has its season), in due season we shall reap.

Having expounded that section I associate it with I Cor. 15:58: "Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not vain in the Lord." Then with that I put the Psalm which says, "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy. He that goeth forth and weepeth bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him." I comment on that passage in Psalms. First, there is activity; the people go forth; we must venture out. Second, they went bearing precious seed; we must go out with the Word of God, which is the seed—"he that goeth forth bearing precious seed and weeping." We must go in earnest. Some people think tears are unmanly, and some tears are, but not all. "Jesus wept."

"Did Christ o'er sinner weep,
And shall our cheeks be dry?"

It was one of the most glorious testimonies of Henry of Navarre by Macaulay:

"He looked upon the foeman and his glance was stern and high;
He looked upon his comrades and a tear was in his eye."

That is his exhortation against weariness in well-doing, because the labor is not in vain. We may fail in other things, but if we take the gospel, if we take it earnestly, if we sow in tears, the heavens may fall, but our harvest will come without a shadow of a doubt. "Doubtless he shall return, bringing his sheaves with him." It is that harvest-home, when the laborer comes bringing his sheaves with him, to which the mind of the preacher should be often turned.

Paul says to the Thessalonians, "Ye are my crown of rejoicing in the time of Jesus Christ"—"bringing his sheaves with him." not coming up to heaven empty-handed. Coming up he says, "Lord, this man in yonder world I led to thee; Lord, this broken heart I healed; Lord, this orphan I comforted, bringing his sheaves with him." His association with him of every rightful tear that is shed, every good deed that he has accomplished, is one of the most precious things in connection with the gospel of Jesus Christ. Then he says, "As we have opportunity, let us work that which is good toward all men, and especially toward them that are of the household of the faith." "As we have opportunity." Opportunity! Dr. Richard Fuller, in a great sermon before the Southern Baptist Convention, gave a picture of opportunity as with swift wing, no bird of the air flying so fast, passing by and never coming back. "Wherefore as we have opportunity" means that we must be wide-awake.

We come now to the last paragraph, and what is the meaning of it? "See with how large letters I write unto you with mine own hand." The King James version says, "You

see how large a letter I have written, etc." Galatians isn't a big letter, but what Paul says is, "See with how large letters I write you with mine own hand."

I have been very much amused in contrasting the views of Farrar and Lightfoot. Generally, Lightfoot is much better than Farrar, but Farrar gets the best of him on the meaning of that passage. Lightfoot says the meaning is, "I am writing to you about weighty matters, and I wrote you a great big letter." He had to force that into it. It isn't there. Paul's acute eye trouble is evident from a previous expression. He says, "You would have taken your eyes and given them to me, if you could." He was writing with his own hand, and a man that is nearly blind has to make big sprawling letters, and there is a touching thought in it. "Do you remember why I have to write with large letters? Don't you remember when I was groping in my blindness, and your sympathy was so tender you would have given me your eyes? Now you see with what large letters I am writing." I think Farrar's explanation much more reasonable. Quickly Paul takes up his argument! He would take up an argument in the midst of his "amen" if he thought of something that he should have said that he had not said. He is giving a contrast between himself and these that insist on being circumcised. He says, (1) that they do this to avoid Jewish persecution, (2) that they do it that they may glory in the flesh, and (3) that they don't do it from love of the law, for they know that they don't keep the law; that circumcision obligates one to keep the whole law.

Then he represents his glory in contrast with theirs: "But far be it from me to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world hath been crucified unto me, and I unto the world. For neither is circumcision anything nor uncircumcision." Then he adds, that they should so walk according to this canon (canon means rule) and as they should walk by this rule, circumcision or un-

circumcision would avail nothing, but a new creature, everything.

"Henceforth [that is, having presented this attack on me in II Corinthians, and in Galatians, and having made this reply] let no man trouble me," as if to say, "I don't want to go into this matter any more." "Now why ought not ye trouble me?" "Because," he says, "I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus." In other words, "I am covered all over with scars; the Roman lictors have smitten me with rods; the Jews have scourged me and left me for dead; once I fought with wild beasts in the arena, and I count these marks of Jesus as Christ's brand of ownership." It is a very beautiful thought.

QUESTIONS

1. What warning does Paul give against false conclusions from the doctrine of justification by faith?
2. What is antinomianism?
3. Give several scriptures which disprove it.
4. What is meant by "fulfilled" in "The law is fulfilled in 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself?'"
5. Explain "end of the commandment" in "The end of the commandment is love."
6. Contrast the fruits of the flesh and the fruits of the Spirit.
7. Explain "overtaken in a fault."
8. Harmonize "Bear ye one another's burdens" and "Each man shall bear his own burden."
9. What the teaching here on ministerial support?
10. Give the law of sowing and reaping.
11. Take Gal. 6:9, I Cor. 15:58 and Psalms 126:5,6 and give a brief outline of an evangelistic address.
12. What is opportunity? Illustrate it.
13. What is the meaning of "large letters" in 6:11?
14. Give three reasons for circumcision on the part of those who were troubling the Galatians.
15. Contrast Paul's glory with theirs.
16. What the meaning of "henceforth let no man trouble me?"

THE BOOK OF ROMANS

VIII

INTRODUCTION

THE prophet Daniel gives a forecast of the rise of five consecutive, great world-empires: Babylonian, Persian, Greek, Roman and the kingdom of God as set up by our Lord. He shows how the people of Israel came in touch with each empire in turn. In this discussion we need to trace out, in historical order, the salient points of contact between Israel and Rome, Daniel's fourth world-empire. The first notable contact was when the Jews were resisting the aggressions of the Seleucids who, with Antioch in Syria as a capital and the head of one of the four divisions of Alexander's Greek empire, and who in contending with the Ptolemys of Egypt, another division of the Greek empire, conceived it necessary to occupy the intervening Holy Land. Their aggression culminated in the attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to destroy the Jewish religion. The apocryphal book of Maccabees and Josephus give a vivid history of this conflict. It was in this struggle between these parts of the divided Greek empire that Rome, rapidly rising to supreme power, intervened and became a staunch friend to the Jews, crushed between the two. The Romans for a long time were faithful to all treaty obligations toward the Jews, but as the Jews developed internal parties among themselves, one or the other, from time to time, would appeal to Rome. In this way Rome became the umpire of Jewish contentions, and finally the master. The whole Herodian dynasty were dependents of Rome.

About B. C. 70 Pompey captured Jerusalem and led away to Rome multitudes of Jewish captives who, though enslaved, were usually kindly treated, and many of them who were set free became Roman citizens. Probably in this way Paul's father became a Roman citizen, so that Paul himself was a citizen free-born. In the development of the history, a vast number of Jews were settled in Rome, having a special Jewish quarter in the city beyond the Tiber. The Roman classics abound with references to the Jews at Rome: Tacitus, Suetonius, Martial, Juvenal, Horace, Persius, Cicero and others. It is a notable fact that 8,000 Jews at Rome protested against Archelaus being allowed to have all the dominion of his father Herod. This led to a division of Herod's kingdom into four parts; hence the name tetrarch, the ruler of a fourth part, to which we have references in the life of our Lord. The Jewish restlessness and turbulence led finally to the appointment of procurators, one of whom was Pilate. Moreover, the points of Jewish contact with Rome multiplied as they also came in contact with the rising fifth world-empire, the spiritual kingdom of our Lord, and culminated A. D. 70 in the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple by Titus, and the wider dispersion of the Jewish people among the nations.

Our next historical question is, How was Christianity established in the city of Rome? Doubtless many Jews from Rome attended the annual feasts in the time of our Lord and became, to some extent, acquainted with the issue between our Lord's kingdom and the ruling party of Jerusalem. It is certain that among the great number of Jews gathered together from various nations, that Roman-Jews and proselytes heard Peter's great sermon on the day of Pentecost, some of whom doubtless were converted on that day. Through these converts, on their return, the gospel may have been carried to Rome. It is much more probable that Stephen's ministry may have sent converts to Rome,

particularly after the dispersion following Saul's persecution. We, at least, note in the salutation of this letter certain kindred of Paul who were in Christ before him. This very fact may account for the bitterness and madness of Paul's persecution of the church, since under Stephen's mighty power a breach had been made into his family-circle. The kindred, we know, were in Rome at the time this letter was written. Then Paul's acquaintance and friendship with Aquila and Priscilla, banished from Rome by Claudius, would increase his knowledge of the personnel of Roman Christians. Moreover, his great meetings held in Syria, Cilicia, Asia, Macedonia and Achaia necessarily brought many Romans, both Jews and Gentiles, under the influence of his ministry. Hence we note in this letter salutations to his converts in Asia. The travel and traffic to and from Rome along the lines of the great Roman roads, extending to the boundaries of the empire, would continually enlarge Paul's knowledge of the Christians at Rome, whether Jews or Gentiles. In this natural way we account for the intimate personal salutations at the close of this letter.

There was no one central church at Rome. They had no common meeting place, but there were several churches meeting in private houses. At least three, we may gather from this letter, particularly the one in the house of Aquila and Priscilla. Hence the letter is not addressed to *the church* at Rome, but to all the faithful in Rome. In accounting for the establishing of Christianity here we must not lose sight of the labors of Christian women, whom he calls fellow-workers, so manifest in the salutation.

It is a lying tradition that makes Peter the founder of Christianity at Rome and the first bishop of the church there.

As we see from this letter there was no central church and there was only a possibility of Peter's indirect influence through his Pentecostal sermon. Stephen's influence in this

direction is more to be credited than Peter's, and Paul's much more than both of them. Aquila and Priscilla should have the credit of establishing the first church there, and the noble Christian women saluted by Paul share the honors with all of them. The Romanists indeed contend that Peter went to Rome immediately after the events recorded in Acts 12:1-18, and remained twenty years. But this contention contradicts the scriptures, for we find him soon thereafter at the council, Acts 15, and still further afterwards at Antioch, Gal. 2:11, and it may be inferred from I Cor. 9:5 that Peter was at that time traveling as an apostle to the circumcision. And so as late as his first letter we find him in Babylon where were many Jews. That he was not at Rome when Paul wrote this letter is evident from the absence of any salutation to him among so many; nor there when Paul arrived more than two years later as a prisoner. There is no reference to him as being in Rome in the letters of either the first or last imprisonment there of Paul.

It has also been contended that the household-churches cited by Paul in this letter were only worshiping and not organized bodies, but this is contrary to the meaning of the word "church," and also to the uniform apostolic method of ordaining elders in every congregation and otherwise fitting them up for housekeeping. They were not like cowmen on the range marking, branding and letting loose. Indeed, there is only one passage in the N. T. that at all connects Peter personally with Rome, and that one only by a more than questionable interpretation, and, moreover, written long after this letter, viz.: I Pet. 5:13. The contention is that by "She that is in Babylon," Peter means heathen Rome, mystical Babylon, a style followed by John in Revelation. But John writes a confessedly mystical book; not of this kind is Peter's first letter. Moreover, John's mystical Babylon is not heathen Rome, but the apostate Christian

church—the woman in purple and scarlet. If Peter had been at Rome when Paul wrote this letter, why was he not saluted by Paul, as well as so many inferior ones? If he were there when Paul arrived as a prisoner, the silence of Acts is unaccountable. If he were there when Paul wrote the third group of letters during his first imprisonment, the silence of Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians and Hebrews is marvelous. If Peter was in Rome during Paul's second imprisonment the silence of II Timothy is marvelous. Another argument against Peter's using Babylon in the sense of Rome, is that in his second letter, presumably from the same place, he quotes Paul's letter to the Romans using the phrase, "hath written unto you." If living at Rome he could not have been writing to Rome and quoting what Paul had written to them. The author does believe that the traditional evidence is sufficient to prove Peter's martyrdom at Rome, but it is mixed with so much incredible and evidently manufactured matter—manufactured for a later purpose—that the real evidence is discounted by its bad company. At any rate, Christianity was established in the city of Rome before this letter was written, though certainly not by the present personal ministry of any apostle. Let the rank and file of the scattered disciples "who went everywhere preaching the Word" have their lawful credit here, as at Antioch and many other places. The claim that Peter was the first bishop at Rome is in every way absurd and unscriptural. The apostles never exercised the office of bishop, or pastor, of a particular church, not even at Jerusalem. Their office was general as contradistinguished from the local office of bishop, or pastor.

We next consider the author, date and place of the letter. Paul's authorship has never been seriously questioned by the scholarship of Christendom. The letter avows it in the beginning, and every internal evidence and all its relations to Galatians and Corinthians support it. The date is

largely determined by its relation to Corinthians and Galatians. In II Corinthians and Galatians he replies to a challenge of his apostolic authority with the internal evidence overwhelmingly in favor of Galatians following Corinthians. In Galatians and Romans he discusses justification by faith, with the internal evidence overwhelmingly in favor of Romans following Galatians, Romans being developed from Galatians. As Ephesians, the more general discussion, follows Colossians, so Galatians, being an off-hand, fiery, impulsive letter, is followed by Romans—a calm, deliberative enlargement. The parallels between the two letters are very striking and abundant. The reader may find in Lightfoot of these remarkable parallels. So, we may say that Paul on Galatians, or in the Cambridge Bible, a fair statement wrote this letter from the house of Gaius at Corinth about A. D. 58. Dr. Robertson's argument for this date in his "Student's Chronological New Testament" is very fine. Lightfoot's argument from internal evidence on the relative order of Corinthians, Galatians and Romans is extraordinarily strong.

The occasion is evident from the letter itself. He is the guest of Gaius in the city of Corinth. He has concluded his labors in those parts, and is about to make his final visit to Jerusalem, carrying the alms for the poor saints there which he has gathered in the great collection in Macedonia, Achaia and Asia Minor. After this Jerusalem-visit he purposes a tour into Spain via Rome. To prepare the way for this forthcoming visit to Rome, he writes this letter, having an opportunity of sending it by Phoebe, a deaconess of the church at Cenchrea, the eastern Corinthian sea-port.

But the purpose of the letter goes far beyond the occasion. The attack on his apostolic authority, and the very heart of his gospel by the Judaizing Christians whom he has been resisting locally and in a somewhat off-hand manner in his letters to the Corinthians and Galatians, he now

realizes to be not only more than a local matter, more than a personal attack on his authority, but an incorrigible far-reaching, fundamental assault on the whole plan of salvation by grace. Impulsive, off-hand and local replies do not meet the exigencies of the situation. There must be a calm, dispassionate and elaborate exposition of the whole plan of salvation sufficient for every emergency and for all time to come. Such a discussion would likely accomplish the greater good and attain the wider circulation if addressed to the saints at the imperial capital, from which as a center radiated influences to all the circumference of the world. Moreover, this very discussion, forwarded at once to Rome, might anticipate and forestall the Judaizing tendency steadily moving westward from Jerusalem. Hence there is nothing local in his argument. The concluding part, with its personal salutations, might well be left out of copies sent abroad, as we actually find to be the case in some later manuscripts. Hence, while it is a letter, it is much more than a letter—it is a doctrinal treatise, a veritable body of systematic theology. While Ephesians, developed from the more local Letter to the Colossians, is of the nature of a general circular, and in this respect somewhat resembling this letter, and while Hebrews bears resemblance in that it is an elaborate discussion of the two covenants, yet addressed to Christian Jews only, this letter is unlike anything else in the New Testament.

It is the most fundamental, vital, logical, profound and systematic discussion of the whole plan of salvation in all the literature of the world. It touches all men; it is universal in its application; it roots, not only in man's creation and fall, but also in the timeless purposes and decrees of God before the world was, and fruits in the eternity after this world's purgation.

It considers man as man and not as Jew or Greek. It considers law, not as expressed in statute on Mt. Sinai, but

as antedating it and inherent in the divine purpose when man was created in the image of God. It considers sin, not in ceremonial defilement, nor as an overt act, but as lawlessness of spirit and nature. It considers condemnation, not as personal to an individual offender because of many overt acts, but as a race-result from *one* offense of the one head of the race. Consequently, it considers justification, the opposite of condemnation, not as an impossible acquittal of a fallen sinner on account of his many acts of righteousness, but as resting on *one* act of righteousness through the Second Head of the race. It considers, not an impossible morality coming from a corrupt and depraved nature, but a morality arising from regeneration, sanctification, resurrection and glorification. It considers, not the divine government and providence as here and there looking in on particular men, in special times and given localities, but as an all-comprehensive sweep from eternity to eternity reaching with microscopical minuteness every detail of the nature of man, and universal in its control of all forces, and all subsidiary to the original divine purpose. The God of this letter is GOD INDEED—not a partial, local deity, not blind chance, not cold, inexorable fate, but a purposeful, omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent, infinitely holy and infinitely loving God.

The integrity of the book has been questioned as follows:

1. Some have thought that the book should close, as they say, with the argument at 14:23, but chapter 15 carries on the thought of chapter 14.

2. Others have thought more plausibly that it should close at 15:33, with the benediction there. They think chapter 16, with its numerous salutations, should close the Letter to the Ephesians where Paul had more personal knowledge. But that letter is a circular letter, and designedly leaves out local references. Indeed, it would fit better to be called the Letter to the Laodiceans.

3. These contentions are somewhat supported by the fact that later manuscript copies omit the concluding sections. But the oldest and best authorities give us the book as it is, and there are natural grounds, or reasons, for the omission of the conclusion in later copies. On the very highest external authority we may take the whole book as it stands. And we have already accounted for Paul's large acquaintance in Rome.

I must not close this introductory chapter without calling attention to the connection between the Old Testament and New Testament as shown by the great number of Old Testament quotations in the book. There are more than three score of these quotations in this book, covering an unusually wide range of books. Genesis is quoted five times, Exodus four, Leviticus twice, Deuteronomy five, I Kings twice, Psalms fifteen, Proverbs twice, Isaiah nineteen, Ezekiel once, Hosea twice, Joel once, Nahum once, Habakkuk once, Malachi once, and there are others more indirectly used.

It is also notable that Paul sometimes quotes from the Hebrew, at other times from the Septuagint, and sometimes follows the spiritual impulse in giving the true sense in his own words.

We now come to the subject of analysis, better illustrated in this book than in any other Bible book. A noted writer has said, "Analysis presents the classification of correlated truth." Prof. Agassiz says, "Thorough classification is but an interpretation of the thoughts of the Creator." Dr. H. Harvey says, "The Bible should be studied analytically. A cursory reading of the scriptures does not interpret them; they must be carefully analyzed if one would penetrate into their full meaning." Dr. Francis Wayland says, "(1) We must have a knowledge of the several *parts* of which it is composed. But this alone gives a very imperfect conception. (2) We must also understand how these parts are put together. This will greatly increase knowledge; but it will

still be imperfect. (3) It is necessary, therefore, that we should have a conception of the *relation* which the several parts sustain to each other, that is, of the effect which every part was designed to produce upon every other part. When we have arrived at this idea, and have combined it with the other ideas just mentioned, then, and not till then, is knowledge complete. It is manifest that this last notion—that of the relation which the parts sustain to each other—is frequently of more importance than either of the others." Dr. Shedd says, "All truth is logical. It is logically connected and related, and that mind is methodical which detects this relation and connection, as it were, by instinct. Now, a methodizing mind is one which by discipline and practice, has reached that degree of philosophic culture in which these systematizing laws work *spontaneously, by their own exceeding lawfulness,* and instinctively develop, in a systematic and consecutive manner, the whole truth of a subject."

Bearing these reflections in mind, I submit for consideration four analyses of the Letter to the Romans, three of them here, and my own later. The first is by Albert Arnold Bennet, of the Baptist Theological Seminary of Japan, and is by all odds the best in many respects. In his book we have three parallel columns, the right hand column containing the Greek text according to Westcott and Hort, the middle column the revised translation verse by verse, and the first column the analysis itself in detail, carried entirely through the book. It is the most remarkable specimen of analysis I have ever known. I am very proud that a Baptist is the author of it. Who would expect such a thing from a Baptist Theological Seminary in Japan?

ANALYSIS OF ROMANS.

(Albert Arnold Bennet, Baptist Theological Seminary, Japan.)

I. The Gospel plan of salvation by Faith, 1-8.

1. The importance of the gospel shown by the moral condition of man, both Jew and Gentile, 1 and 2.
2. The gospel plan of justification by faith, 3-5.
3. The gospel plan of the sanctification and glorification of those justified by faith, 6-8.

II. The problem of Israel's unbelief (a reconciliation of the gospel plan of salvation set forth in 1-8, with the seeming rejection of God's chosen people, 9-11.)

1. Israel's unbelief and God's severity, 9, 10.
2. Israel's unbelief and God's goodness, 11.

III. Faith applied; or, the duties of those who have been saved by Faith, 12-16.

1. (Of broadest application) Duties, individual or common, belonging to every Christian, strong or weak, 12, 13.
2. (Of more limited application) Duties largely relative; especially duties of the strong on account of the weak, 14, 15.
3. (Of narrowest application) Greetings, and directions about fellowship, mainly designed for the original readers only, (but suggestive, by inference, of application on a broader scale), 16.

The next outline is by Dr. A. T. Robertson:

Introduction, 1:1-17.
1. The Doctrine of a righteousness from God. 1:18—11:36.
(a) Its necessity. 1:18—3:20.
(b) Its nature. 2:21—4:25.
(c) Its results. 5:1—11:36.
(1) It makes possible peace and joy, 5:1-11.
(2) It is analogous to the relation of Adam to the race, 5:12-21.
(3) It should lead to greater holiness, 6-8.
(4) It throws light on the salvation of Jew and Gentile, 9-11.
2. General and special exhortations growing out of a righteousness from God, 12:1—15:13.
3. Personal matters. 15:14—16:23.
The closing doxology, 16:25-27.

The third analysis is by my lamented and scholarly colleague, Dr. John S. Tanner:

Introduction: 1:1-17.
1) 1:1-7, Salutation.
(1) 1:1a, Author's name and character.
(2) 1:1b, 6, His mission (apostleship).
a. 1:1b, Source (divinely called).

b. 1:2-4, Nature: Gospel.
a) 1:2, Fulfillment of prophecy.
b) 1:3f, Concerning Christ.
c. 1:5a, Agency of Appointment (Christ).
d. 1:5bf, Sphere: To all Gentiles, including Romans.
(3) 1:7, Salutation proper.
2) 1:8-15, Paul's deep personal interest in the Roman Christians.
(1) 1:8, Thanksgiving for their faith.
(2) 1:9-15, His desire to visit them.
a. 1:9f, Had prayed to this end.
b. 1:11f, Motive of the visit.
c. 1:13, Had often purposed to come.
d. 1:14f, The desire prompted by his obligation to all classes.
3) 1:16f, Theme of the letter: The gospel the power of God unto Salvation universally available through righteousness of faith.

I. 1:18—8:39, The plan of salvation.

1. 1:18—4:25, Method of justification.
1) 1:18—3:20, Not by works of law (legalism) because guilt and condemnation are universal.
(1) 1:18-32, Case of the Gentiles.
a. 1:18, The wrath of God abides upon them; because
b. 1:19-23, They refused the light given them.
a) 1:19f, They had a revelation of God in nature and conscience.
b) 1:21-23, But they consciously turned from Him to idolatry.
c. 1:24-32, The result was to plunge them into the depths of guilt.
(a) 1:24-28, God withdrew His beneficent restraints.
(b) 1:29-32, Their depravity was deepened.
(2) 2:1—3:19, Case of the Jews.
a. 2:1-16, Argument stated: God's judgment will be on the basis of moral conduct.
(a) 2:1-5, Folly of arrogant confidence in special divine favor.
(b) 2:6-11, Judgment will have reference to moral conduct in view of the amount of light possessed.
(c) 2:12-16, It is obedience, not to the letter, but to the spirit of the law that is availing.

b. 2:17—3:8, Objections answered:

(a) 2:17-24. First objection: Being possessors and teachers of the law is assurance of their acceptance. Ans.—Additional sin in teaching what they do not practice.
(b) 2:25-29. Second objection: Circumcision is availing. Ans.—Efficient circumcision is not of the flesh but of the heart.
(c) 3:1f. Third objection: Then the Jew has no advantage. Ans.—They have much advantage, particularly that they are the recipients of divine revelation.
(d) 3:3f. Fourth objection: For a Jew to be lost would annul the promises. Ans.—Not so.
(e) 3:5-8. Fifth objection: Unjust in God to punish sin that displays His righteousness. Ans.—This is absurd.

c. 3:9-19. Conclusion: Jew as well as Gentile is hopelessly lost.
(a) 3:9a. The Jew has no advantage in the matter of justification; because
(b) 3:9b, 18, Both alike are under sin.
(c) 3:19, Purpose of the law is to *convict* of sin.
(3) 3:20, Therefore, legalism as a method of justification is a failure.

2) 3:21—4:25, It is by grace through a righteousness of faith, available alike to Jews and Gentiles.
(1) 3:21-26, This method stated and described.
a. 3:21-24, Its character.
(a) 3:21a, Apart from law.
(b) 3:21b, A righteousness of God.
(c) 3:21c, Witnessed by the O. T. scriptures.
(d) 3:22a, Through faith in Christ.
(e) 3:22b, Universal.
(a) 3:22b, Available to all.
(b) 3:23, Needed by all.
(f) 3:24, Distinctly gratuitous.
b. 3:25f, Its basis: Propitiatory sacrifice of Christ.
(a) 3:25a, A Propitiation provided by God.
(b) 3:25bf, For the reconciliation of God's righteousness and the sinner's justification.
(2) 3:27—4:25, Its bearing upon Jewish conduct and faith.
a. 3:27-30, Upon their conduct.
(a) 3:27f, Condemns their pride.
(b) 3:29f, Condemns their exclusiveness.
b. 3:31—4:25, Upon their faith.
(a) 3:31, Does not subvert but confirms the O. T. law.
(b) 4:1-25, Is not contradicted, but confirmed by the case of Abraham.
(a) 4:1-8, Abraham was justified by faith and not by works.
aa. 4:1-3, The scriptures so declare.
bb. 4:4f, This excludes a condition of works.
cc. 4:6-8, Confirmed by the observation of David.
(b) 4:9-12, Circumcision not a condition; for Abraham justified before circumcision.
(c) 4:13-22, The promise to Abraham was conditioned on faith, not law.
aa. 4:13, Statement of the fact.
bb. 4:14-17, A legal condition would annul the promise.
cc. 4:18-22, The historical facts of the faith of Abraham.
(d) 4:22-25, The method in Abraham's case equally applicable to all who believe on Christ.

2. 5:1—8:39, The completion of salvation (sanctification), as based upon this method of justification.
(1) 5:1-21, The method of justification promises the completion of the divine work of salvation.
(1) 5:1-5, That it is by faith.
a. 5:1f, Having received such a gift, we should realize our blessed state and be confident of the consummation.

b. 5:3-5, We should embrace gladly God's trying means of discipline.

(2) 5:6-11, Christ's sacrifice for us as rebels insures the completion of His work of salvation in us as His children.

(3) 5:12-21, The same is further assured by the superiority of the redemption in Christ over the loss in Adam.

a. 5:12-17, (First parallel and contrast) Christ's work more extensive; efficient for the multiplied sins and sinners.

b. 5:18-21, (Second parallel and contrast) Christ's work more intensive; overcomes both Adam's sin and the sin of the individual developed through disobedience to the law.

2) 6:1-23, This method of justification encourages not sin but its abandonment.

(1) 6:1fa, Proposition stated.

(2) 6:2b-13, The change of personal relations involves a life of righteousness with Christ and a death to sin.

a. 6:2b-6, This is set forth in baptism.

b. 6:7-13, As Christ's death and resurrection were once for all, so should be the believer's death to sin and resurrection to righteousness.

(3) 6:14-20, That the believer has exchanged sin for grace as a master which forbids that sin should longer dominate him.

(4) 6:21-23, The mutual antipathy of sin and grace are evident from their opposite results, viz.: Death and eternal life.

3) 7:1-25, The law a failure as an agency of sanctification.

(1) 7:1-6, The believer's objection to the law has been annulled by death, and he has entered into another companionship, viz.: A fruitful one with Christ.

(2) 7:7-23, The law, though righteous in itself, is unable to produce good works.

a. 7:7-13, In the unbeliever its effect is to manifest and aggravate the presence and character of sin.

b. 7:14-23, In the believer likewise, it aggravates, but does not overcome sin.

(3) 7:24f, Conclusion: Efficacy only in a personal relation to Christ.

(4) 8:1-27, The believer's sanctification is accomplished by the guiding and transforming work of the Holy Spirit.

(1) 8:1-8, He implants a disposition to holiness that freely attains in life and conduct what was impracticable as obedience to law.

(2) 8:9-11, The resurrection of Christ is a guaranty of the renovation and resurrection of those in whom the Spirit dwells.

(3) 8:12-17, The Spirit bears personal witness to the believer of the latter's sonship to God and joint inheritance with Christ.

(4) 8:18-27, The Spirit also prompts and guides to hopeful longing and righteous supplication for the consummation.

(5) 8:28-30, Believers are the elect of God, PREDESTINED to be called, justified, SANCTIFIED and GLORIFIED.

(6) 8:31-39, Triumphant peroration on the blessedness of the believer.

II. 9:1—15:13, PRACTICAL BEARING OF THESE FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS UPON CHOICE, LIFE AND CONDUCT.

1. 9:1—11:35, The apostasy and rejection of the Jews.
(1) 9:1-5, Paul's intense grief over the fact.
(2) 9:6—10-21, Moral responsibility for the fact.
(1) 9:6-29, God not culpable.
a. 9:6-13, His promise not broken.
(a) 9:6-8, The promise not given to all the natural seed of Abraham.
(b) 9:9-13, God's plan of discrimination exemplified in the cases of Isaac and Jacob.
b. 9:14-24, It could not transcend His absolute sovereign right.
(a) 9:14-18, Scripture proof that God's acts are sovereign.
(b) 9:19-24, His right unimpeachable.
c. 9:25-29, That only a fraction will be saved, is according to prophecy.
(2) 9:30—10:21, The Jews themselves are to blame, for their rejection was caused by their self-righteous unbelief.
a. 9:30—10:3, Their zeal for righteousness has been misdirected.
b. 10:4-13, The true way, viz., belief in Christ upon testimony of the preached gospel, much simpler than the one they employed.
c. 10:14-21, Israel has heard and refused.
(a) 10:14f, Importance of preaching admitted.
(b) 10:16, Israel did not believe.
(c) 10:17f, Having heard the gospel.
(d) 10:19-21, And having been warned in prophecy of their apostasy.
(3) 11:1-32, Limitations of the fact.
(1) 11:1-10, It is only partial.
a. 11:1fa. The salvation of Paul himself proves it.
b. 11:2b-4, The doctrine of a remnant exemplified in the experience of Elijah.
c. 11:5-10, God makes sure of a few by election of grace.
(2) 11:11-32, It is only temporary and conditional.
a. 11:11-24, Israel will surely be regrafted upon his native stump.
b. 11:25-32, His lopping off is only a part of the divine plan of universal mercy.
(3) 11:33-35, Exclamation over the supreme wisdom and knowledge of God.
2. 12:1—15:13, Reflections and exhortations on Christian conduct.
(1) 12:1—13:14, On the general conduct proper for a Christian.
(1) 12:1f, As a child of God.
(2) 12:3-21, As a member of the church.
(3) 13:1-7, As a citizen.
(4) 13:8-10, As a member of society.
(5) 13:11-14, As one who expects the judgment.
2) 14:1—15:13, Special directions concerning non-essentials of faith.
(1) 14:1-13a, One no right to interfere with another.
(2) 14:13b—15:13, Obligation to self-restraint for the sake of others on basis of love and edification.

CONCLUSION: 15:14—16:27.
(1) 15:14-16, Paul's apology to the Roman Christians for his letter to them.
(2) 15:17-22, Explanation of his past course.
(3) 15:23-29, His plan of future operations.
(4) 15:30-33, His request for their prayers.
(5) 16:1f, Commendation of Phoebe.
(6) 16:3-24, Salutations.
(7) 16:25-27, Benediction.

Having these three analyses before us, and all of them good, it may seem immodest to submit my own. But there are to my mind overwhelming reasons arising from defects in the others, particularly on chapters 3 and 8—the most vital in the book. But my own analysis will appear in the body of the discussion.

QUESTIONS

1. Of what group of great letters is this a climax?
2. What prophet forecast the succession of five world-empires, what the name of each, what the Jewish touch with each, especially what the salient points of Jewish contact with the Romans in historic order, and who the most important Jewish writer of this history?
3. How may we account for the multitude of Jews in the city of Rome, what position did they occupy there, and what Roman classical authors refer to them?
4. How was Christianity established in Rome, and what the credit due, respectively, to Peter, Stephen, Paul, Aquila and Priscilla, and the women mentioned?
5. What the proof from the letter itself of at least a remote connection between the Jerusalem-apostles and the planting of Christianity in Rome?
6. What the proof from the letter that Paul's converts were not the only factors in planting Christianity there?
7. How may we account for Paul's extensive personal acquaintance with Christians there?
8. To whom was this letter written, why not addressed to the *church* at Rome, and what is a better way to express it?
9. What the evidence that there were many Christians in Rome at this time?
10. Were these Christians there Jews or Gentiles, or both? If both, which mainly?
11. Who was the amanuensis?
12. What the scriptural evidence pro and con for the Romanist contention that Peter went to Rome and remained there twenty years just after the incidents of Acts 12:1-18, and what the answer to the Romanist interpretation of I Pet. 5:13?

13. How was it impossible for Peter to have been the first bishop of the church at Rome?
14. Is the traditional evidence credible that Peter was martyred at Rome, and if so, how is it yet discounted?
15. If there was not one central church at Rome, what evidence that the several worshiping congregations were organized bodies with officers?
16. Who the author of this letter, and what the proof from the letter itself?
17. What the date of this letter and how obtained, and where was it written?
18. What circumstances conditioned the writing of this letter as expressed in the relation of this letter to I and II Corinthians and Galatians?
19. What the internal proof of the relation of Romans to Galatians?
20. What the occasion of this letter?
21. What the purpose of this letter?
22. What is the nature of this letter?
23. What other books of the Bible may be classified with it as a discussion, or treatise, on a great theme?
24. How is it unlike anything else in the N. T.?
25. What questions have been raised as to the integrity of the book?
26. How does this letter emphasize the connection between the O. T. and the gospel of the N. T.?
27. What the importance of an analysis? Quote the sayings of Prof. Agassiz, Dr. Harvey, Dr. Wayland and Dr. Shedd on this subject.
28. What analyses were commended by the author?
29. Which analysis is the most remarkable in literature, and what its excellencies?
30. In what two respects does Dr. Robertson's outline excel?
31. In Dr. Robertson's outline what is the great theme of the letter?
32. In Bennet's outline what the theme?
33. In Tanner's outline what the theme?
34. Are these three themes practically the same?

IX

PAUL'S SALUTATION, THANKSGIVING AND PRAYER

Scripture: Rom. 1 : 1-17

THE theme of this letter is found in Paul's own words: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is revealed a righteousness of God from faith unto faith: as it is written, but the righteous shall live by faith." This theme condensed is, The Gospel Plan of Salvation. But someone asks, "Why not 'Righteousness of God' the theme?" Because this righteousness is only the means to the great end—"salvation."

THE SALUTATION, 1 : 1-7

We gather from the salutation the following things: (1) The writer: "Paul." (2) Those addressed: "To all that are in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints," *i. e.*, Christians. (3) The salutation itself: "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."

The writer is particularly described, (1) In his *status,* as a "servant of Jesus Christ." (2) In his *office,* as "called to be an apostle." (3) In his *ordination,* as "Separated unto the gospel of God." (4) In the *direct object of his work,* as "Unto obedience of faith among all nations," including the Romans themselves: "Among whom are ye also." (5) In the *ultimate reason for his work,* as "For His name's sake."

His "gospel of God" is described, (1) As "promised afore through his prophets." (2) As recorded "in the holy scriptures." (3) "As concerning His Son."

That Son is described thus: (1) According to the flesh, the Son of David. (2) According to Spirit of Holiness, declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead. (3) As our "Messiah and Lord." (4) As the author of grace and apostleship.

THE THANKSGIVING, 1:8

The ground of thanksgiving is thus expressed: "That your faith is proclaimed throughout the whole world."

This universal proclamation of the faith of the Roman Christians may be accounted for as follows: Rome was the world's capital and center of governmental unity. To and from it, over the great military roads and ship lines, were constant tides of travel and traffic, so that a whisper there reached the boundaries of the empire. To Paul, at least, working along these roads or sailing over these sea-courses there came continual news of the progress of the gospel there. There were his kindred, his converts, his acquaintances from many lands, with whom he had constant communication.

THE PRAYER AND ITS REASON, 1:9-15

This prayer is thus expressed: "If by any means now at length I may be prospered by the will of God to come unto you." It is described, (1) As sincere: "God is my witness." (2) As unceasing: "How unceasingly I make mention of you, etc."

The reasons for this prayer are, (1) To impart some spiritual gift looking to their establishment. (2) For mutual comfort in each other's faith. (3) That he might have some fruit in them as in other Gentiles. (4) Because he was a debtor both to Greeks and Barbarians, wise and fool-

ish. (5) Because he was ready to preach at Rome as well as elsewhere. (6) He had been hindered in his purposes to visit them hitherto (see also 15:22). (7) He was not ashamed of the gospel in any crowd.

The following conclusions may be drawn from this prayer: (1) That he counted Rome in the sphere allotted to him. (2) That on account of its central and political position as the world's metropolis, its strategical importance as a radiating mission-base surpassed all others. (3) That the archenemy of the gospel understood this importance as well as Paul, and so far, had barred him out of the field. Hence the necessity of this prayer. Twice in this letter he refers to this hindering of his purpose to come to them (1:13 and 15:22) and in I Thess. 2:18 we find that Satan is the hinderer. (4) We learn from Acts 23:11 that it was the Lord's will for him to visit Rome according to this prayer, which says, "By the will of God." Thus we see Satan and his emissaries opposing Paul's approach to Rome, while Paul was longing and praying to get there. God's will over-ruling Satan's will in answer to the prayer. And he prayed "if by *any* means," leaving that also to God, and we learn that he went in bonds (Acts 27:1 and 28:20). (5) This prayer with its reasons opens the way to a statement of the great theme of the letter.

Let us now analyze the theme of the letter, 1:16, 17. This theme involves the answer to these questions: What is the gospel, to whom addressed and on what terms, what its power, what the salvation unto which it leads, how is it a power to this end, what the righteousness revealed, what the meaning of "from faith unto faith," and what the varied uses of the quotation from Habakkuk? The gospel is the whole story of Christ's mediatorial work as Prophet, Sacrifice, Priest, King, Leader and Judge, addressed to the whole human race, whatever the nationality, sex or social condition, on the terms of simple faith in Jesus as He is offered

in the gospel, the power of which is God himself, *i. e.*, God the Holy Spirit. The salvation unto which it leads consists generally in (1) What it does *for us.* (2) What it does *in us.* (3) What it leads us *unto.*

We find in this letter that Paul uses salvation in the sense of justification. Man is saved when he is justified; but in another part of the letter we hear him talking about a salvation that is to be revealed at the last day, and we hear Peter talking about that too. Then we, in this letter, also hear him speaking of salvation in its symbols—in its figures. When we get to Romans 6 we have salvation in baptism and in the Lord's supper—not actual salvation, but salvation pictorially presented. Then in this letter we hear him tell about the redemption of the soul, the buying back of the soul; then we hear him tell about the redemption of the earth on which man lives. So salvation is a big thing. Let us now define it. Salvation is the final, complete and everlasting deliverance of the sinner's entire soul and body from the guilt of sin, from the defilement of sin, from the dominion of sin, from the bondage of Satan, and the deliverance of man's habitat—this old world—from the curse upon it.

Note now what it is *unto.* It is *unto* something as well as *from* something. We have seen what it delivers from. Now it is a deliverance unto what? Unto *an everlasting inheritance* prepared in heaven. It can't mean less than that. We can't say it is all of salvation for the soul to be justified when the body is not saved; we can't say the body is saved until it is raised from the dead and glorified. And we can't say that we are saved unto our inheritance until we get to it.

I will state in another form what salvation is. Salvation, in its legal aspects, is expressed by three words: First, justification. (Justification is the declaration of a competent court that one tried before it is acquitted.) The second legal term is redemption. (Redemption is the buying

back of what had been sold.) The third term is adoption. That is a legal term also. We are not naturally children of God, and we get into the family of God by adoption. He adopts us into His family. Adoption is that legal process by which one, not naturally a member of the family, becomes legally so. Now I say that salvation, so far as legal aspects go, is expressed by these three words—justification, redemption and adoption. Paul discusses every one of them in this letter. When I am justified before God, *that* delivers me from the wrath to come. I said that it was a deliverance from the guilt of sin. Justification does that—it delivers us from the guilt of sin.

Let us look at salvation as done *in us*. What are the terms? Those terms are regeneration and sanctification. What is regeneration? Regeneration is giving a holy disposition to the mind. The carnal mind is enmity against God, not subject to His law, neither could be made subject to His law. Man in his natural state hates God, hates truth, hates light. It is not sufficient that a man be redeemed from the curse of the law, or the wrath of the law, and be acquitted. It is necessary that he have a mind in harmony with God. That occurs in us; God begins a good work in us, and continues it to the day of Jesus Christ. And that good work in us is expressed by regeneration and sanctification. Regeneration gives us a holy disposition, but the remnants of the flesh are still with us. Then sanctification commences and more and more conforms us to the image of Jesus Christ, as we go on from strength to strength, from glory to glory, from faith to faith. That is what it does in us.

The legal part is accomplished fully right here on earth. The very minute we believe, that day we are justified; that day we are redeemed; that day we are adopted. The salvation in us, referring to the soul, is consummated just as soon as the soul gets through its discipline and is freed from

the body. On the other side we see the spirits of the just made perfect. That is the end of the salvation as far as the soul is concerned. But salvation takes hold of the other parts of the man—his body that lies mouldering in the ground. God provided in the garden of Eden for the immortality of the body. When sin expelled the man and he had no longer access to that tree, his body, of course, began to die. Salvation must save that body. That comes in the resurrection which he discusses in this letter. In the resurrection these things all take place: First, the body is made alive, quickened. Second, it is raised. Third, it is glorified. And glorification means what? What these words say, "It is sown in weakness; it is raised in strength: it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in honor; it is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption; it is sown a mortal body; it is raised an immortal body." It is sown a physical body; it is raised a spiritual body. It is sown in the image of the first Adam; it is raised in the image of the Second Adam. That is the entire man, isn't it? I said it was the complete and everlasting deliverance of the entire man, soul and body. Then fourth, we must bring those two saved parts together. So Christ brings the spirits with Him. He raises the dead, and the spirits go back into the old house, now renovated and glorified.

We have not yet come to the end. That is what is done *for us,* and what is done *in us,* but it isn't the deliverance *unto* that inheritance that is reserved in heaven, that the heart of man never conceived of—the precious things that God has in reservation for those that love Him. That is Paul's idea of salvation as it is presented in this letter, and never less than that.

There are a great many people that say, "I am saved from death." "How do you know you are saved?" I ask. "Well, I believe in Jesus Christ and am justified." "That is very good as far as it goes, but when Jesus laid hands on you

didn't it mean more than redemption, justification and adoption? Didn't he do anything inside of you?" So the salvation goes on in sanctification.

The King James version reads in verse 4: "Declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness." Does that mean Christ's personal spirit of holiness or does it refer to the Holy Spirit? In other words, is it referring to the instrumentality of the Holy Spirit in quickening Christ's body, or does it mean that Christ rose from His inherent personal spirit of holiness? If we answer this correctly, we also answer one of the most difficult other passages in the Bible, towit: I Peter 3, last clause of verse 18 and through the 19th: "Being put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit; in which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison." We have the same question in that passage. It is easy to see how the Revised Standard answers the question in both cases. But I say, "Does the Revised Standard rightly interpret either?" Precisely the same question recurs in I Tim. 3:16, where the Standard Revision follows its usual interpretation. Is it right in any of them? I think not.

QUESTIONS

1. What the theme of this letter in Paul's own words?
2. What the condensed theme?
3. Why is not "The righteousness of God" the theme?
4. What do we gather from the salutation?
5. How is the writer particularly described?
6. How is his "gospel of God" described?
7. How is the Son described?
8. What the ground of thanksgiving?
9. How may we account for the universal proclamation of the faith of the Roman Christians?
10. What Paul's prayer here?
11. How is it described?
12. Why this prayer?
13. What the conclusions from this prayer?
14. Analyze the theme of this letter, 1:16, 17.
15. What then is the gospel?

16. To whom addressed?
17. On what terms?
18. What the power of this gospel?
19. Of what does the salvation unto which it leads consist?
20. Define this salvation, and explain fully each of the aspects of salvation, defining also the terms used.
21. What the interpretation of 1:4, and what the parallel between it and I Pet. 3:18, 19 and I Tim. 3:16?

X

THE UNIVERSAL NECESSITY OF SALVATION

Scripture: Rom. 1:18-32

HAVING considered in the latter part of the preceding chapter the meaning of salvation, we now follow the apostle's argument in showing

THE UNIVERSAL NECESSITY OF SALVATION

The argument applies to the whole human race, to man as man, both Jew and Gentile. In this discussion we have the case of the Gentiles. They are guilty of ungodliness. They are unlike God in their nature. Originally man was made in God's image and likeness:

"And God said let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. And God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them. And God blessed them: and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb yielding seed, to you it shall be for food; and to every beast of the earth, and to every bird of the heavens, and to everything that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for food: and it was so. And God saw everything that He made, and, behold it was very good. And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day." Gen. 1:26-31.

This original state of man shows his likeness, his dominion, and his commission. This image and likeness being lost through sin, they are out of harmony with the Creator.

They are guilty of unrighteousness. Their deeds are evil, proceeding from an evil nature. Their sin of deeds con-

sists of both omission and commission. They have not only failed by way of omission to exercise their dominion and execute their commission, but they have actively done contrary to both. The wrath of God has been revealed from heaven against both their sin of nature and deed. This wrath is the assessed penalty of violated law. Here we need to understand the law. What is law? In its last analysis law is the intent, or purpose, of the Creator in bringing a being into existence. That intent is set forth in the passage cited, Gen. 1:26-31. This law inheres in the very constitution of our being, and hence as a principle antedates any particular formal statute. Indeed, all statutes are but expressions of antecedent, inherent, constitutional law, as the multitude of statutes are but expressions of the law-principles in the constitution of nations and states.

Or, varying the definition, we may say that all law arises from and inheres in relations. Where there is no relation there is no obligation, as the relation of parent and child measures the reciprocal obligations binding parent and child. So the relation between husband and wife, citizen and the state, the creature and the Creator, the redeemed and the Redeemer. With each new relation there arises a new obligation measured by the relation. Law, then, inheres in the intent of the Creator, and is antecedent to all statutes and independent of them, except only their fountain, or source. When He brings a being into existence, the law of that being inheres in the Creator, and in the relations of that being. This is law in its last analysis as set forth by the apostle, but in this very context (2:12) and many times elsewhere, he speaks of law, as that given on Mt. Sinai to the Jew, which will be noticed more particularly later.

Sin therefore is lawlessness, or any lack of conformity with law, whether in nature or in omission or commission of deed. An omission of duty and commission of sin are but symptoms or expressions of a sinful nature. As our

Lord said: "But the things which proceed out of the mouth come forth out of the heart; and they defile the man. For out of the heart come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, railings," Matt. 15:18, 19. As He again said: "By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but the corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit," Matt. 7:16-18. "Either make the tree good, and its fruit good; or make the tree corrupt, and its fruit corrupt; for the tree is known by its fruit," Matt. 12:33. That preacher therefore had no adequate conception of sin who defined it as, "The wilful transgression of a known law." The greatest of all sin is a sin of nature. It is not dependent in obligation on our knowledge. Paul says, "Though I know nothing against myself, I am not thereby justified." Both natural and spiritual laws bind and have penalty notwithstanding our ignorance. The ignorance itself is sin, or may be a result of sin. And transgression is only one overt act of sin. It is equally sin to fall short of law or go beyond it, or to deflect from it. Righteousness is exact conformity with law. With this conception of law, and of sin, the apostle speaks of its penalty, the wrath of God—a wrath that is antecedent to its revelation. And yet this wrath is revealed. So now we consider

THE REVELATION OF WRATH

God has not left them ignorant of sin's penalty. The knowledge of God, and their relation to Him, is manifest both in them and to them. There are two books of this revelation—the book of nature in them and the book of nature outside of them. He has planted knowledge in them. "The spirit of man is the lamp of Jehovah, searching all his innermost parts," Prov. 20:27. As the natural eye is

the lamp of the body, so the spirit is Jehovah's lamp. "If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is the darkness!" Matt. 6:22, 23. Or the apostle, in the context, further describes the revelation in us: "For when Gentiles that have not the law do by nature the things of the law, these, not having the law, are the law unto themselves; in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith, and their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing them." Man, therefore, by the very constitution of his being, has a knowledge of God, law, sin and penalty. Therefore by nature he is a worshiping being. When through sin the light in him is darkened he may and does worship false gods, yet everywhere he is a worshiper.

This internal light is not a faint spark, but a great light. With every man in the world there is an internal sense of right and wrong. Men may differ among themselves as to what particular thing is right or wrong, but all have the sense of right and wrong. They are keenly alive to their rights and keenly sensitive to their wrongs. But there can be no right and wrong without some law to prescribe the right and proscribe the wrong. And there can be no law without a law-maker. And there can be no law without penal sanctions, otherwise it would be no more than advice. And there can be no penalty without a judgment to declare it and a power to execute it. But every man knows that even and exact justice is not meted out in this world—that many times the innocent suffer and the guilty triumph. Therefore the conclusion comes like a conqueror, that there must be

A JUDGMENT TO COME AND A WRATH TO COME

There never was a man who has not at some time, under a keen sense of wrong done him, appealed to this future judgment and invoked upon the wrong-doer the wrath to

come. It is this knowledge or consciousness of future judgment and wrath that makes death frightful to the evil-doer. And it is this consciousness of amenability to God's future infallible judgment and inexorable wrath that restrains crime more than the dread of all human law and judgment. So it is demonstrated that there is in us a revelation of wrath against sin.

But the apostle argues a revelation of wrath outside of us and in the broad book of Nature. He says, "For the invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even His everlasting power and divinity; that they may be without excuse," 1:20. His deity and His everlasting power are "clearly seen" in the universe which is the work of His hands. To the same effect speaks the Psalmist:

"The heavens declare the glory of God;
And the firmament showeth His handiwork,
Day unto day uttereth speech,
And night unto night showeth knowledge.
There is no speech nor language;
Their voice is not heard.
Their line is gone out through all the earth,
And their words to the end of the world.
In them hath He set a tabernacle for the sun,
Which is a bridegroom coming out of his chamber,
And rejoiceth as a strong man to run his course.
His going forth is from the end of the heavens,
And His circuit unto the ends of it;
And there is nothing hid from the heat thereof," Psalm 19:1-6.

And this apostle to the Athenians:

"The God that made the world and all things therein, He, being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is He served by men's hands, as though He needed anything, seeing He himself giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and He made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek God, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us; for in Him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain even of your own poets have said, For we are also His offspring. Being then the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is

like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and device of man. The times of ignorance therefore God overlooked; but now He commandeth men that they should all everywhere repent: inasmuch as He hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness by the Man whom He hath ordained; whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead," Acts 17:24-31.

Yea, not only Nature, but Providence in Nature, as was said to Noah: "While the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease," Gen. 8:22. And reaffirmed by this apostle: "And yet He left not himself without witness, in that He did good and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with food and gladness," Acts 14:17. Thus all nature in us or external to us, and God's marvelous providence proclaim the knowledge of Him. Tom Paine, the deist, admitted all this, and expressed his admiration for Addison's paraphrase of Psalm 19:

The spacious firmament on high,
With all the blue ethereal sky,
And spangled heav'ns (a shining frame),
Their great Original proclaim:
Th' unwearied sun, from day to day,
Doth his Creator's power display,
And publishes to every land
The work of an Almighty hand.

Soon as the evening shades prevail,
The moon takes up the wondrous tale,
And nightly to the list'ning earth
Repeats the story of her birth:
While all the stars that round her burn,
And all the planets, in their turn,
Confirm the tidings as they roll,
And spread the truth from pole to pole.

What though in solemn silence all
Move round the dark terrestrial ball;
What though no real voice nor sound
Amid their radiant orbs be found;
In reason's ear they all rejoice,
And utter forth a glorious voice,
Forever singing as they shine,
The hand that made us is divine.

The stoic philosopher might magnify inexorable and pitiless fate, the Epicurean philosopher, or his descendants, the modern evolutionists, might glorify chance in attributing this great universe and its people to "the fortuitous concourse of atoms," thereby proclaiming themselves brother to the fool that said in his heart, "no God." They need to read the lesson of Nebuchadnezzar, to whom God announced this sentence:

"Let his heart be changed from man's, and let a beast's heart be given unto him; and let seven times pass over him. * * * The same hour was the thing fulfilled upon Nebuchadnezzar: and he was driven from men, and did eat grass as oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven, till his hair was grown like eagles' feathers, and his nails like birds' claws," Dan. 4: 16, 33.

The evolutionist indeed classifies himself with beasts by acknowledging a brute ancestry.

This revelation was sufficient to leave them without excuse because when they thus knew Him as God they were guilty of these sins:

a. They glorified Him not as God.
b. Neither were thankful.
c. Became vain in their reasonings.
d. Darkened their senseless hearts.
e. Professing to be wise, they became fools.
f. Became idolaters, changing the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man, birds, beasts, and creeping things. This brought on them

JUDICIAL BLINDNESS

God gave them up to the reign of their passions. Both women and men became shameless. As they refused to retain the knowledge, God being put out, with what were they filled?

"And even as they refused to have God in their knowledge, God gave them up to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not fitting; being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, hateful to God, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, unmerciful," 1:28-31.

THE RESULT

"Who, knowing the ordinance of God, that they that practice such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but also consent with them that practice them," 1:32.

QUESTIONS

1. How does the argument for the universal necessity of salvation apply to the whole human race?
2. What the four arguments applied to the Gentiles?
3. What is ungodliness?
4. What is unrighteousness?
5. What the consequent wrath of God?
6. What is law?
7. What its relation to formal statutes?
8. From what does all law arise?
9. What the principal relations from which all law arises?
10. What other use of the term "law" in this letter?
11. What then is sin?
12. What its penalty?
13. How is the wrath of God revealed?
14. What must follow the fact of right and wrong?
15. When and why a judgment of wrath?
16. What Paul's argument for a revelation of wrath from the book of nature, and what the logical conclusion with reference to the position of the Stoic and Epicurean, or the modern evolutionist?
17. Why were the Gentiles left without excuse, and of what sins were they guilty?
18. What the consequences?
19. Since they refused to retain the knowledge of God, with what were they filled?
20. What the result?

XI

THE UNIVERSAL NECESSITY OF SALVATION (Continued)

Scripture: Rom. 2:1-16

WE have in the previous chapters shown: 1. The great theme of the letter to be (1:16, 17) God's plan of salvation, and we have analyzed and defined the terms of the compound proposition which embodies it.

2. We have found that this plan contains a revelation of God's righteousness as the only ground of salvation.

3. We then in the last chapter commenced to study the necessity for this salvation as found in a revelation of God's wrath, which stands over against the revelation of His righteousness.

4. We found in part just how this revelation of wrath is made both in us and out of us, towit: (a) In the very constitution of our being, "The spirit of a man being the lamp of the Lord." (b) In the operation of the conscience, either accusing or excusing. (c) In the order of the material universe which discloses the deity and power of the Creator. (d) In God's continual government of the universe by His providence evident in the recurring seasons. (e) In the appeal of all men to God's judgment for unrighted wrongs, and the invocation of His wrath upon the wrong-doer. (f) In the social order of men established everywhere, whatever the form of government, through which men define and punish wrong. (g) In the worship of all men everywhere in which by sacrifice in some form they seek to placate the offended Deity and appease His

wrath. (h) In their very idolatries, by which they seek to lower the Deity to their own level and even beneath their level, and in their veiling their pollutions under the cover of worship, they yet bear testimony to Deity and their amenability to His judgment. (i) In that their lives showed that nature's light, whether external, internal, or providential, has no power to regenerate or sanctify, and no power to propitiate or justify. It could alarm and condemn, but could not save. It was sufficient, but not efficient. Hence the necessity of a plan that would have the power unto salvation. Here I want to insert the contrast between the light of nature and the light of the gospel, both of them being very brilliant, but one of them sufficient and the other efficient. In Psalm 19, which has already been quoted in part, we have this language:

"The heavens declare the glory of God;
And the firmament showeth His handiwork.
Day unto day uttereth speech,
And night unto night showeth knowledge.
There is no speech nor language;
Their voice is not heard.
Their line is gone out through all the earth,
And their words to the end of the world.
In them hath He set a tabernacle for the sun,
Which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber,
And rejoiceth as a strong man to run his course.
His going forth is from the end of the heavens,
And His circuit unto the ends of it;
And there is nothing hid from the heat thereof."

This is an abundance of light, and a sufficiency of light, but notice the contrast:

"The law of Jehovah is perfect, restoring the soul;
The testimony of Jehovah is sure, making wise the simple (Nature's light cannot help the fool).
The precepts of Jehovah are right, rejoicing the heart:
The commandment of Jehovah is pure, enlightening the eyes.
The fear of Jehovah is clean, enduring forever:
The ordinances of Jehovah are true, and righteous all together.
More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold;
Sweeter also than honey and the droppings of the honeycomb.
Moreover, by them is thy servant warned."

Here it is the design of the Psalmist to put in contrast the light of nature and the light of God's work. In one of them the knowledge is sufficient, in the other the light is both sufficient and efficient. As bearing upon the sufficiency of that light I wish to cite the comment of an old Puritan preacher, who says:

"Now the preaching of the heavens is wonderful in three respects: (1) As preaching all the night and all the day without intermission, verse 2. One day telleth another, and one night certifieth another. (2) As preaching in every kind of language, verse 3. There is neither speech nor language, but their voices are heard among them. (3) As preaching in every part of the world, and in every parish of every part and in every place of every parish, verse 4. Their sound is gone into all lands, and their words unto the end of the world. They be diligent pastors, as preaching at all times; learned pastors, as preaching in all tongues, and catholic pastors, as preaching in all towns."

Let us compare the words of this old Puritan with what Paul says in this very letter to the Romans: In chapter 10 he quotes it and we see how he uses it, showing that if man was not a sinner he could learn in nature the way to nature's God. He says, "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without the preacher? and how shall they preach, except they be sent? even as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that bring glad tidings of good things. But they did not all hearken to the glad tidings." Then he quotes Isaiah and also this very Psalm:

> "But I say, Did they not hear? Yea, verily,
> Their sound went out into all the earth,
> And their words unto the ends of the world."

The last verse of chapter 1 affirms that there was sufficient knowledge so that God's ordinance made such deeds as were enumerated worthy of death, and yet it declares that they themselves wilfully disobeyed and consented to disobedience in others. I ask the reader to note particularly that it is very far from the apostle's thought to belittle the light of nature. He boldly avows its sufficiency, but in that it lacks efficiency there is necessity for another light which is "the power of God unto salvation."

Our present discussion continues the argument on that necessity as follows: Having this light, sinners are "inexcusable" because they, as individuals and as society, pass judgment on others, not excusing them, therein condemning themselves in all wrongdoing. He starts out with the declaration in chapter 2:1 that whenever the individual man passes judgment on a fellow-man for alleged wrongdoing, and whenever organized society passes judgment on a member of society, that proves that they are inexcusable if they do wrong, since by their judgment they have established the principle of judgment. And in verse 2 he advances to a new thought: "And we know that the judgment of God is according to the truth against them that practice such things." What is that judgment of God that we know so confidently? How do we know it? What is the knowledge? The knowledge there is the knowledge that comes from nature. His argument demands that from the light of nature in us and outside of us we know that God's judgment on such things as are enumerated in that first chapter is according to truth—that the things there enumerated are wrong, and that when God punishes them the punishment is just.

In verse 3 he asks this question: "Reckonest thou this, O man, who judgest them that practice such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?" On what kind of reasoning shall a man who lives entirely

apart from the Bible, and yet does claim light enough to pass judgment on the wrong-doer, escape the judgment of God? If the wrong is done to him by organized society, whether tribe or clan or nation or republic or a limited monarchy, no matter what the government is, that government holds some things to be wrong and assesses punishment worthy of death. "Now," he says, "do you suppose that you will escape the judgment of God? You certainly cannot." We have no hope from such light as is in nature, because in nature every violation of law receives a just recompense of reward—every one, whether we know the law of nature or not. If a man puts his hand into the fire it will burn him. If he takes poison it will kill him. Confining our judgment to the law of nature, any hope that we may indulge and with which we may solace ourselves, is foolish, since we cannot escape the judgment of God.

He advances in the argument: "Or despisest thou the riches of His goodness and forbearance and longsuffering?" The thought there is that God doesn't punish every week—that in the moral government of the world a long time sometimes elapses between the commission of a crime and its exposure, and in multitudes of cases exact justice is never rendered in this world. Paul asks that question because of God's method of delay in His final punishment. What is the reason of the delay? He says that it is from "the riches of His goodness and forbearance and longsuffering." God is good; God is patient; God bears a long time before He strikes. "Now are you going to despise that?" As the apostle says, "Not knowing that the goodness of God was designed to lead thee to repentance." There you get at the real reason of God's delay in punishing in His moral government. There was no delay in the case of Adam. When he sinned God made the inquisition. He called him to His bar at once. Since that time why doesn't He do that? Because that very day grace intervened, and

man was put upon a grace probation, and the gospel was preached that day in that the Seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. And the throne of grace was set up that day. On the east side of the Garden dwelt God with the cherubim to keep open the way to the tree of life. This delay comes from His goodness, His forbearance and His longsuffering. And the reason for that goodness, forbearance and longsuffering was to give the man, though guilty and worthy of instant death, the opportunity to repent, not through anything in him, but through grace. What Paul there says, Peter affirms. In II Peter 3 he answers the question, What construction shall be put upon the long delay of God in punishing men? What is meant by it? He says, "The Lord is not slack concerning His promise [that is, that He will come and judge the world] as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to youward, not wishing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." That is His motive. The apostle asks a question: "Is it because you see that God doesn't strike the very minute that the sin is committed, is it because you despise that goodness and that forbearance, that delay, or is it ignorance of the motive of that delay that His goodness in that respect shall lead you to repentance—is that the reason?" We are told in the O. T., "Because sentence against an evil deed is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil," Ecc. 8:11. They despise the goodness, and they ignore the motive of the delay.

He then in verse 5 makes this statement: "But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up for thyself wrath in the day of wrath." "Thou dost treasure up wrath." The wrath of God is cumulative. If God waits to punish and a man despises His waiting and ignores His motive, then he has added to the cause of wrath, *i.e.*, the wrath accumulates.

It is more important that we as preachers should understand this reason of God's delay, which is the idea of cumulative wrath, than to know anything else in the Bible except the very heart of the gospel itself.

I will illustrate that thought so that it may be clear. One Puritan preacher said that man's despising of the delay of God's payment of sin reminded him of a foolish fellow that comes into an inn because he can buy things on credit, and ignores the fact that behind the door the innkeeper is scoring up, charging, charging, charging for the pay-day that will come. Another preacher has illustrated it this way: A man comes to a tiger's den when the old tiger is away and picks up a little cub and marches off with it, perfectly serene and unconscious that stealthy feet are following him, and at a turn in the road, with a scream that frightens him, the tiger springs upon him and rends him. Another preacher has used this illustration: A house had been built below a huge rock-dam in a river, and a family had lived there for some time in security, and as day after day passed their sense of security became more confirmed and more formidable, and they were wilfully ignoring the fact that up above the stream was rising, that the water was increasing, that it was accumulating in volume and accelerating in speed, massing up, and after a while in one moment the dam split and the overwhelming water destroyed the hapless family.

Peter presents the same thought in the passage that I cited, but I did not conclude. In this he presents that cumulative thought: "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief [that is, they will not be looking for it]; in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, * * * and the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing that these things are thus, all to be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy living and godliness?" The day is deferred, but God is not slack as

men count slackness. With Him 1000 years is as one day, and one day is as 1000 years, but the day will come, and when it comes it will be as a thief in the night.

Take another illustration: God explained to Abraham how his descendants could not immediately take their territory. He says, "The measure of their iniquity is not yet full." Once in preaching on that I drew on a piece of canvas two vessels of equal size, one of them, the vessel of opportunity and the other the vessel of iniquity. As the vessel of opportunity empties, the other one fills up. As the opportunity grows less the iniquity-measure grows larger. Whenever the vessel of opportunity is empty and the vessel of iniquity is full, God strikes.

Another preacher has used this illustration: A man buys a long rope and stakes out his horse. The horse prances around and grazes about as if he were a free horse, but other horses come by that are not staked, and he tries to go off with them, but he can only go to the end of his tether, and that rope measures the diameter of the circle in which he can graze. As he keeps running about, the rope winds round the stake, and every time he goes round, the rope gets shorter, and after a while his head is right up to the stake.

But the most forceful illustration of this thought is a sermon of Jonathan Edwards in New England. He took this text: "Their feet shall slide in due time." His discussion runs as follows: "They are rejoicing that they have sometimes kept their foot-hold when they walked over slippery ground and over ice. They have a vain confidence that they can stand, but in due time their feet will slide. The sinner's feet did not slip from under him last week, when he committed a sin. He was terribly frightened that first day, and the next day he was less frightened, and by the third day still less, until finally he forgot it, but in due time his feet will slip; God has appointed the time." He

is really, as Jonathan Edwards pictured, walking on an incline plane as slick as glass, and when the right time comes it isn't necessary to push him—his feet will slip themselves, and at the other end of that plane are the depths of hell.

Hence judgment is that in order for law to restrain crime there must be a certain punishment. As long as the transgressor in civil or criminal matters can think of escaping punishment or devising some expedient by which he shall not be punished, it has no restraining power over him, but when it is absolutely certain that whether it be soon or late that every evil deed shall receive a just recompense of reward—whenever he gets that conviction on his mind, that restrains him. When God makes inquisition of faults He remembers, and when He holds up the light of revelation to the sinner's heart, He will make the man remember. When this light bores into his very soul, he will see the slime of every foul thought, every beastly act, every vile sin. God will make him remember.

We come now to a thought concerning this wrath that we must not forget, viz.: that this revelation of God's wrath is not immediate. It is a wrath to come. There are temporary judgments on man and on nations, and there are chastisements of God's people here on earth, but when we talk about the wrath of this text, it is the wrath of a certain, inexorable, definite day. It is the day of wrath. Hence Paul at Athens, while explaining how God has delayed to punish these heathen, and that God has overlooked the times of ignorance, *i.e.*, passed over them temporarily, but now He calls upon all men to repent, because He has appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom He has ordained. And isn't it strange that when the Bible so many times speaks of that awful day in the future—speaks of it as a set day, and connects it indissolubly with the second advent of Jesus

Christ, that men will talk about the advent of Christ being imminent, liable to come at any time?

It is not liable to come at any time. It can come but at one time, and that time is not a sliding scale. It is an appointed day, and as at His first coming He could not come till the fulness of time, so His second advent, as Paul says, cannot be until all these other things take place.

Not to make a mistake about that day, let us see what Paul further says about it. In I Cor. 3 he says that this day will be revealed in fire, and that that revelation of fire will try every man's work, saint and sinner, and in II Thessalonians he expressly declares as follows:

"Which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God * * *; if so be that it is a righteous thing with God to recompense affliction to them that afflict you, and to you that are afflicted rest with us, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven with the angels of His power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus: who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of His might, when He shall come to be glorified in His saints."

That shows that that day is to be revealed with fire, and the last book of the O. T. closes with the declaration:

"For, behold, the day cometh, it burneth as a furnace; and all the proud, and all that work wickedness, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith Jehovah of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. But unto you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in its wings."

The next point about the judgment is that it will be universal on that day. It is not broken up into a series, the righteous judged, and 1000 years after that the wicked judged. Hence in Matt. 12:14 our Lord says, "The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation," one saved and the other unsaved, and again in Matt. 25:31 He says, "When the Son of man shall come in His glory, * * * then shall He sit upon the throne of His

glory." Then comes the separation. They are all there together, good and bad, and hence in Revelation 20 John says, "I saw a great white throne and He that sat on it and all the dead, great and small, are gathered before Him," and some are judged out of the book of life and saved; all not in the book of life were cast into a lake of fire.

This day of wrath is here considered apart from the gospel, for he has not come to the gospel yet. This day considered that way is according to works. In chapter 3 he takes up the gospel, but here he is discussing the *necessity* for the gospel: "Who will render to every man according to his works."

Let us look at each case: To them that by patience in well doing seek for glory and honor He will render eternal life. If any man, leaving the gospel out, can show that he has been patient in well-doing, and that he has been seeking glory and honor and incorruption, God will render to him eternal life. Here is the other class: Unto them that are factious, and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish (notice the words, "wrath," "indignation," "tribulation" and "anguish") upon all without respect to race, the Jew first, also the Greek. But glory and honor and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first and also to the Greek, that the judgment shall be without any respect of persons. That is the thought.

What is the extent of that judgment? Let our Lord speak. The extent is soul and body: "Fear Him that [after man is dead] hath power to destroy both soul and body in hell," or as He presents it in Matt. 25: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." This is the duration of the punishment. The extent is soul and body, the duration "unto everlasting punishment." Or as He says in another place, "Where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." Or as He expresses it in yet another place:

"In hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment, and saw a great gulf fixed, that no man could pass over." And his memory worked: "Son, remember, remember, remember." It is without discrimination of race. Both Jew and Gentile are included. It is also without respect of persons: "For there is no respect of persons with God." This judgment is according to the light that a man has. If he has not the law, he perishes without the law. If he has the law of Moses, he perishes under the law of Moses.

The last thought is the most stupendous. I will barely state it. When the day of wrath that nature tells about comes, it will be a day of wrath according to the gospel. That shows why the delay, why the punishment does not come at once. When He goes to judge, the judgment will be according to the gospel in order to show the heinousness of despising this delay. Following the motive of that delay, we come to the Judge: "According to my gospel, by Jesus Christ." God has committed all judgment to Him. In all this argument He is laying the foundation for bringing in the plan of salvation. He is showing that the light of nature in us, while sufficient, is not efficient—that it cannot save, it cannot regenerate, it cannot sanctify, it cannot justify us.

Let us restate these thoughts with some additions. I first explained what the wrath meant, and then the several ways in which it is revealed. We now come to consider the part of the text which shows where, by whom, and for what this wrath, in the sense of a penalty, is exacted. Our text says, "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel, by Jesus Christ." Let us look at that statement in all of its fulness. From the day that the original penalty due to Adam's sin was suspended by the intervention of the gospel of Jesus Christ under a probation of grace, all men, whether Jew or Gentile, have been freed from the immediate execution of that divine

wrath. There have been earthly judgments on wicked men, and chastisements on Christian men, but the full penalty of the wrath of God has never yet been visited upon man. When a wicked man dies, he goes at once to hell, but if that were counted full execution of the divine penalty that man would not have to leave hell to come and stand before the judgment of God. And if a Christian when he dies goes immediately to heaven, that is not to be considered the full salvation of that man. The reason is that the body is not involved in either case. When this wrath of God is visited upon man it is visited upon both soul and body. We need to fix in our minds clearly the reason of a judgment day at the end of time, instead of ten thousand judgment days all along through time. I have given the first point. The second reason is that in the very nature of the suspension of the penalty under a covenant of grace, space is given for repentance. Peter and Paul both discuss that proposition, Paul here in the chapter where he says, "Not knowing that the goodness of God was intended to lead thee to repentance." Peter discusses it in his second letter where he says that we must construe the longsuffering of God toward sinners to mean salvation. The third reason is that neither a good man nor a bad man can thoroughly understand until the judgment day the reasonableness of God's government and be constrained, whether condemned or saved, to admit the righteousness of the sentence pronounced.

No man will realize the exceeding sinfulness of sin, the exceeding richness of God's forbearance, nor the fulness of God's grace in fixing the final decision until that day.

We know now only in part, but then we shall know as we are known. The wicked, as quick as a flash of lightning, will see the exceeding sinfulness of all their past sins. In the case of every man before his conversion he realizes that the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, who can know it? "I, the Lord." He is the only one. It

is the easiest thing in the world for a man, when he looks at his good qualities, to take a telescope and look through the little end of it and see them more in number and larger in bulk than they really are. But he reverses that telescope to look at his faults, and sees them infinitesimally few and small, and by the same strange power that he sees double in the first group, he sees his faults blend and become fewer in number. He sees one star with the naked eye where there are two, and just a splash in the milky way where there are ten thousand distinct worlds. By a kind of "hocus pocus" he takes up his little handful of evil deeds and begins to apologize for them, and finally stands off and says, with complacency, "Now, Lord, see my record. You can see how my good preponderates over the evil." Right at that time comes the flashing of the supernal light of infinite holiness upon the scales and presto! what a change.

These good deeds that look so mountainous and multitudinous begin to diminish in size and number and shrink and pulverize until they become like fine dust. One breath of wrath blows them away like powder. On the other side that little infinitesimal group of evil begins to multiply and magnify and swell and tower and blacken until it is a great mountain range, peak after peak, oozing with the putrid poison of that abominable thing which God hates—SIN.

So in a sense never before, will all then admit that by the deeds of the law no man can be justified.

I am giving the reasons why that final light of judgment is postponed to the last day of time. I want to add another reason.

No man is competent to take account of the evil of his deeds or the good of his deeds until he sees the end of their influence. It is impossible for a man to do anything that terminates in himself, but it will surely touch everybody connected with him, father, mother, brother, sister, friend. Not only so, but after it has cast its gloom over all the circle

of those that are nearest to him, by ties of consanguinity, there is that awful power of action and reaction that carries it on till the judgment day.

If we drop a little pebble into a placid lake—a stone no larger than the end of the finger—by the power of action and reaction the tiny ripples begin to radiate until they strike the utmost shores of that lake. So time is the ocean into which our deeds are dropped and the influence of our deeds in their radiating wavelets in every direction never stops until it strikes the shores of eternity. How then can any judgment inflicted now make that man see? Those that are in hell today don't see it. Those in heaven today do not see it.

It will take the light of the judgment day to bring out the full realization, and when that time comes there will be one instantaneous and universal dropping upon the knees. Every knee shall bow, all together—all the lost in hell and all the saved in heaven, and every tongue shall confess.

When a man is just about to turn around under the "depart" of God's final condemnation of soul and body and go into hell forever, before he goes he will say, "Lord God, in my condemnation thou art just."

Judgment of man here upon this earth is based upon uncertain proof. How many times the most notorious criminal is compelled to be acquitted simply from the lack of legal evidence! There is moral conviction in the minds of the judge and the jury that he is guilty, but the proof did not show it in a legal way. In that day all evidence will be in hand, and the law construed and vindicated with even and exact justice. There can be no suborning of testimony, no blindfolding the eyes of the judge with a bribe, no reticence on the part of witnesses as to what they saw or heard. The evidence will be complete, not only to God, but, as I have said, to man. If ever any Christian allows himself to indulge in feelings of pride and thinks that in the partner-

ship between him and God that his "I" is a capital letter and God is spelled with a small "g," it won't be that way up there.

He will know that his salvation is not of works, but from its incipiency in God's election to its consummation in the glorification of his body, that athwart the whole long extended golden chain of salvation shall be written in the ineffaceable letters of eternal fire, "SALVATION IS OF GRACE," and across the whole dark descending stairway to eternal hell, over every step of it, in letters of fire, "MAN'S DAMNATION IS OF HIMSELF."

God wisheth not the death of any man. God does not arbitrarily send any man to hell. The secrets of men!

There never yet has been in human breast a heart that did not hide some skeleton secret, not only secrets because he keeps them to himself, but secrets that he is unconscious of through the dimness of his knowledge and callousness of his heart.

A writer has said that in that day, in the flash of an eye, memory will go back over all our past and bring up our sins, not in the glamour and rose color of their commission, but in the beastliness and ghastliness and horribleness with which God views them.

"In the day when God shall judge." That day is fixed. God has appointed a day, says Paul, talking to the heathen idolaters, in which He will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ. It is strange that in view of the clear statements that the judgment day is just as much fixed and unchangeable as any past event, as to its time, and in view of the fact that it is correlated with the resurrection of the just and the unjust and with the second coming of Christ, that some men conceive that that day may be this evening or tomorrow, like the pre-millennial view of the second advent. Just as sure as Christ could not come at first until the fulness of time, and until all the preparatory

steps had been taken, just so sure the second advent will take place only when all the predictions of coming events have been fulfilled. We don't know the day, but it is fixed and unalterable, and its penalties inexorable and without remedy.

Now comes another strange thought—that judgment in the last day will be, says Paul, "according to my gospel." The judgment of the heathen will be according to this gospel, and it will be well for him, even if a lost soul, that he be judged according to this gospel. There cannot be a case of a lost man in which it should be better for him to be judged by somebody else than Jesus. Here is a little baby that has never personally committed any sin. It dies one hour from its birth without ever lisping its mother's name. It has inherited sinfulness of nature. It died, in the sense of condemnation, when Adam sinned. To put it as an extreme case, let us call it a heathen baby. Suppose he was not judged by the gospel. He would be forever lost. But the gospel points to another Head, Jesus Christ the Second Adam. The death of Jesus Christ avails for the salvation of that one whose condemnation is only on account of Adam's sin and only on account of inherited depravity. If it were not for the gospel that child would perish throughout eternity, because the law could not save him. All the heathen children who die before they reach the years of personal accountability are saved. Take the adult heathen. Even if he be lost, it is better for him that he be judged according to the gospel than merely according to the law of nature. There is never any mercy in the law of nature. In the light of grace, Paul, speaking of the heathen, says: "The times of this ignorance God overlooks." In Christ He bears with the sins of the heathen in a way that the law could not bear. Let a baby and a man stick their hands into the fire. The fire burns the baby who is ignorant the worst because it is most tender.

But when Jesus judges the heathen, He judges them more kindly, because they lacked knowledge, and though the man be lost forever, there are degrees in hell. Not every man who goes to hell will have the same extent of suffering. It is not like running all the sentences into one mould so that they will all come out alike, as candles, in length and thickness, but according to light and opportunity Jesus will judge. The servant that knows not his master's will and does it not, shall be punished with few stripes. If there is one principle of the final judgment of Jesus Christ that is transcendently above any other principle it is this principle, that the judgment will be rendered according to the light, the privilege, the opportunity.

There will be discriminations made, based even on heredity. Say that some little child inherited a greater thirst for liquor than another in the same family. The sin of one who is consumed by this hereditary thirst will not be held as heinous as another's who wilfully acquired it. Then the question of environment enters into it. A little street Arab who was born in a dark alley in a great city and never heard one word of love, never the subject of one act of tenderness, never knew a mother except through her shame, never was in a Sunday school, not only taught but forced to steal. It is impossible that God would visit upon that thief the same degree of punishment that he would visit upon the Sunday school superintendent, whose father and mother were pious, who received a training in the Sunday school, held office in the Sunday school and talked continually and taught holy things, if he should turn thief and transgress God's holy law. His damnation would be deeper and darker than will be the case of the other. Hear the words of Jesus, "It shall be more endurable in the judgment for Sodom and Gomorrah than for these cities." Why? Because these had great light; those little light. That is why it is a benefit to a lost man to be judged by Jesus Christ.

That is one of the sweetest thoughts that ever creeps into my mind—that Jesus shall be my judge. No wonder David, when God put the alternative before him, "Would you rather fall into the hands of your enemies or into the hands of the living God," said, "Lord God, let me fall into thy hands. Don't leave my chastisement to be assessed by men." I never think of God's judgment except with satisfaction. Even when I am thinking about things I have done that are wrong, I am glad that God is to be the judge.

QUESTIONS

1. By way of review what have we found: (1) As to the theme of this letter? (2) As to the ground of salvation? (3) As to the necessity for this salvation? (4) As to how this revelation of wrath is made in us and out of us?
2. Having this light, why are sinners inexcusable? Explain, "And we know, etc.," verse 2.
3. What is the force of Paul's question, verse 3?
4. What is God's method of punishment, verse 4?
5. What is the reason for the delay?
6. What is meant by cumulative wrath? Illustrate.
7. When is the "day of wrath?" Give proof.
8. How is it to be revealed? Give proof.
9. Give proof that the judgment on that day will be universal.
10. According to what?
11. What is each case?
12. What the extent of punishment?
13. What the duration? Give proof.
14. Show that it will be without discrimination of race.
15. Without respect of persons.
16. What part does the light a man has play?
17. Why a judgment at the end of the world?
18. Give proof that the judgment day is fixed.
19. How is the judgment to be by the gospel of Jesus Christ? Illustrate.
20. What the transcendent principle of the judgment?
21. What the effect of heredity at the judgment?

XII

THE UNIVERSAL NECESSITY OF SALVATION
(Concluded)

Scripture: Rom. 2:17—4:25

I REVERT to the passage, 2:6-9, referring to judgment: "Who will render to every man according to his works: to them that by patience in well-doing seek glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life: but unto them that are factious, and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that worketh evil." That discussion of the judgment is the judgment of law without gospel consideration. Otherwise it contradicts the whole plan of salvation set forth in the letter, for it makes patient continuance in well-doing the basis of salvation.

Another point in chapter 2 is that under the law, being a Jew outwardly could not save a man. The real Jew is one inwardly and has circumcision of the heart. He must be regenerated, and the publication of the grace-plan all along ran side by side with that law-plan, even in the O. T.

God never had but one plan of salvation from the beginning.

That leads to this question, If, being naturally a Jew, and circumcised according to the Jewish law, and keeping externally the ritual law did not save him, as chapter 3 opens—what advantage then hath the Jew? The answer to that is that to the Jews were committed the oracles of God, and they had a better chance of getting acquainted with the true plan of salvation. Then what if some of these Jews were without faith? That does not destroy that advantage; they

had the privilege and some availed themselves of it. Does that not make the grace of God of none effect? In other words, if God is glorified by the condemnation of unbelievers, how then shall the man be held responsible? His answer is, "God forbid," for if that were true how could God judge the world? That supposition destroys the character of God in His judgment-capacity. If God were the author of sin and constrained men by an extraneous power to sin, He could not be a judge. All who hold the Calvinistic interpretation of grace must give fair weight to that statement. Whenever God does judge a man, His judgment will be absolutely fair.

Once when a party of preachers were discussing election and predestination I asked the question, "Do you believe in election and predestination?" The answer was, "Yes." "Are you ever hindered by what you believe about election in preaching a universal gospel? If you have any embarrassment there it shows that you have in some way a wrong view of the doctrine of election and predestination." A young preacher of my county went to the wall on that thing. It made him practically quit preaching, because he said that he had no gospel except for the sheep. I showed him how, in emphasizing one truth according to his construction of that truth, he was emphatically denying another truth of God. That brings up another question: If the loss of the sinner accrues to the glory of God, why should he be judged as a sinner? A supposition is made. Under that view would it not be well to say, "Let us do evil that good may come?" There were some slanderous reports that such was Paul's teaching. He utterly disavows such teaching or that any fair construction of what he preached tended that way.

We come now to his conclusion of the necessity of the gospel plan of salvation. He bases it upon the fact that under the law of nature, providence and conscience, under

the law of Sinai, under any form of law, the whole world is guilty.

"There is none righteous, no, not one;
There is none that understandeth.
There is none that seeketh after God;
They have all turned aside, they are together become unprofitable."

So apart from the gospel plan of salvation there is universal condemnation.

We come to his next conclusion, 3:13-18, that man's depravity is total. Total refers to all the parts, and not to degrees. He enumerates the parts to show the totality. That doesn't mean that every man is as wicked in degree as he can be, but that every part is so depraved that without the gospel plan of salvation he cannot be saved:

"Their throat is an open sepulchre;
With their tongues they have used deceit;
The poison of asps is under their lips;
Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness;
Their feet are swift to shed blood;
Destruction and misery are in their ways;
And the way of peace have they not known:
There is no fear of God before their eyes."

With mankind universally guilty, and every member totally depraved, we get another conclusion—that whatever things the law says, it says to those under the law. No matter whether the law of conscience, the law of nature, or the moral law of Moses, those under the law must be judged by the law. That being so, he sums up his conclusion thus: "By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in His sight."

That brings us to consider the gospel plan of salvation which extends from verse 21 of this chapter to the end of chapter 8, and covers four points—justification, regeneration, sanctification, and glorification. For the present we will discuss that part called justification. He commences

by stating that while there is no righteousness by the law, there is a righteousness apart from the law, and this way of salvation apart from the law is witnessed by the law itself and by the prophets, and that this righteousness is presented to both Jew and Gentile without any distinction, and that always has been the way from the beginning of the world to the present time. If God has seemed to discriminate in favor of the Jews, He looked toward the Gentiles through the Jews, and if He now seems partial to the Gentiles against the Jews, He is looking toward the restoration of the Jews. This righteousness is presented to all men on the same terms—faith—and this righteousness presented by faith is of grace. Man doesn't merit it, either Jew or Gentile—it is free.

It is the hardest thing in the world to convince a sinner that salvation comes from no merit of his, and that faith is simply the hand that receives. Throughout all the length of the great chain of salvation it is presented without discrimination of race, color, sex, or previous condition of servitude.

We come now to the ground of it. That ground is redemption through Christ. To redeem means to buy back. It implies that the one was sold and lost. It must be a buying back, and it would not be of grace if *we* did the buying back. It is a redemption through *Jesus Christ.* He is the Redeemer—the one who buys back. The meritorious ground consists in His expiation reaching us through His mediation. He stands between the sinner and God and touches both. The first part of His mediation is the payment of that purchase-price. He could not, in paying the purchase-price, stand for God unless God set Him forth as a propitiation. He could not touch man unless He himself, in one sense, was a man, and voluntarily took the position. The effectiveness of the propitiation depends upon the faith of the one to receive Jesus. That covers all past

sins. When we accept Jesus we are acquitted forever, never again coming into condemnation. I said that that "covers past sins." We must understand this. Christ's death avails meritoriously once for all for all the sins of a man, past, present and future. But in the methods of grace there is a difference in application between sins before justification and sins after justification. The ground is one, before and after. But the Holy Spirit applies differently. When we accept Jesus by faith as He is offered in the gospel, we at once and forever enter into justification, redemption of soul and adoption into God's family, and are regenerated. We are no longer aliens and enemies, but children and friends of God. God's grace therefore deals with us as children. Our sins thereafter are the sins of children. We reach forgiveness of them through the intercessions of our High Priest and the pleadings of our Advocate (See Heb. 9:25, 26; 7:25; I John 2:1). We may be conscious of complete peace when justified (Rom. 5:1,) but our consciences condemn us for sins after justification, and peace comes for these offenses through confession, through faith, through intercession, through the application of the same cleansing blood by the Holy Spirit. So in us regeneration is once for all, but this good work commenced in us is continued through sanctification with its continual application of the merits of Christ's death. Therefore our theme says, "From faith to faith." Not only justified by faith, but living by faith after justification through every step of sanctification. We don't introduce any new meritorious ground. That is sufficient for all, but it is applied differently. Justification takes place in heaven. It is God that justifies. The ground of the justification is the expiation of Christ. The means by which we receive the justification is the Holy Spirit's part of regeneration which is called cleansing. Regeneration consists of two elements, at least—cleansing and renewing.

But the very moment that one believes in Christ the Holy Spirit applies the blood of Christ to his heart and he is cleansed from the defilement of sin. At the same time the Holy Spirit does another thing. He renews the mind. He changes that carnal mind which is enmity toward God. Few preachers ever explain thoroughly that passage in Ezekiel: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and you shall be clean. I will take away your stony heart and give you a heart of flesh." There is the cleansing and the renewing. Jesus says, "Born of water and Spirit." There are no articles in the Greek. It is one birth. In Titus we find the same idea: He saved us "by the washing of regeneration," the first idea, and "the renewing of the Holy Spirit," the second idea.

This method of justification enables God to remain just in justifying a guilty man. If we could not find a plan by which God's justice would remain, then we could find no plan of justification. How do we understand that to be done upon this principle of substitution? J. M. Pendleton in his discussion of this subject based upon a passage in the letter to Philemon, explains it. Paul says, "If thou hast aught against Onesimus, put it on my account." Now Philemon can be just in the remission of the debt of Onesimus, because he has provided for the payment of that debt through Paul; so Christ promised to come and pay our debt and the payment is reckoned to the man that accepts Christ, thus showing how remission of sins in the case of O. T. saints precedes the actual payment, or expiation, by Christ. God charged Abraham's debts to Christ, and Christ promised to pay them when He should come into the world. Abraham was acquitted right then. So far as God was concerned, the debt was not expiated until Christ actually came and died. In our case, expiation precedes the faith in it. He expiated my sins on the cross before I was born. There came a time when the plan of salvation by that expia-

tion was presented to me, and I received it, and then remission took place.

This plan of salvation by faith not only justifies God, but absolutely excludes any boasting upon the part of the man. If the man had paid the debt himself he could claim to be the cause of this justification. But since he did not contribute one iota to the payment of the debt, there is no possible ground for him to boast. This plan brings out God's impartial relation both to Jew and Gentile, since both are admitted upon equal terms.

We come to an objection that has been raised. If God acquits the man without his having paid the penalty of the law, does not that make the law void? His answer is an emphatic denial. It not only does not make the law void, but it establishes the law. How? The law is honored in that the Substitute obeys it and dies in suffering its penalties. Further by the fact that this plan takes this man saved by grace and gives him, through regeneration, a mind to obey the law, though it may be done imperfectly, and then through sanctification enables him to obey the law perfectly. It fulfills all of its penal sanctions through the one who redeems and through the Holy Spirit's work in the one that is redeemed. When I get to heaven I will be a perfect keeper of the law in mind and in act. We can easily see the distinction between a mere pardon of human courts, which is really contrary to law, and a pardon which magnifies and makes the law honorable. It was on this line that I once preached a sermon on the relation of faith to morals, showing that the only way on earth to practice morality is through the gospel of Christ. So we see that God can be just and the justifier of the ungodly.

Salvation that comes up to the point of justification will, through the same plan, be continued on to the judgment day. In his argument to prove that God's plan of salvation has always been the same, Paul illustrates it by the two

most striking O. T. cases that would appeal to the Jewish mind, one of which is the case of Abraham's conversion which is recorded in Genesis 15. Up to that time Abraham was not a saved man, though he was a called man and had some general belief in God. At that time he was justified, and he was justified by faith, and righteousness was imputed to him; it was not his own. That was before he was circumcised, and it deprived him of all merit, and made him the father of all who could come after him in the spiritual line. He proves this by the promise to Abraham and his seed, and shows that that seed refers, not to his carnal descendants, but to the spiritual descendant, Jesus Christ. Then he goes on to show that as Isaac, through whom the descent flowed, was born, not in a natural manner, but after a supernatural manner, so we are born after a supernatural manner. He then takes up the further idea that that was the only way in the world to make the promises sure to all the seed.

Take the thief on the cross. He had no time to get down and reform his life. He was a dying sinner, and some plan of salvation must be devised which would be as quick as lightning in its operation. Suppose a man is on a plank in the deep and about to be washed away into the watery depths. He cannot go back and correct the evils that he has done and justify himself by restitution. If salvation is to be sure to him, it must work in a minute. That is a great characteristic of it. David was their favorite king. His songs constituted their ritual in the temple of worship. He testifies precisely the same thing: "Blessed is the man whose sin is covered," that is, through propitiation. Blessed is the man to whom God imputeth no transgression. He takes these two witnesses and establishes his case. He shows that the results of justification are present peace, joy and glory, thus commencing, "Being therefore justified by faith, let us have peace with God."

QUESTIONS

1. What judgment is referred to in Rom. 2:6, and what the proof?
2. Who was the real Jew?
3. What advantage had the Jew?
4. Did all Jews avail themselves of this advantage?
5. Does that not make the grace of God of none effect, and why?
6. Does the doctrine of election hinder the preaching of a universal gospel, and why?
7. If the loss of the sinner accrues to the glory of God, why should he be judged as a sinner?
8. What is Paul's conclusion as to the necessity of the gospel plan of salvation, and upon what does he base it?
9. What Paul's conclusion as to man's depravity, what is the meaning of total depravity, and how is it set forth in this passage?
10. What his conclusion as to the law?
11. What then his summary of the whole matter?
12. What the theme of Romans 3:21—8:39, and what four phases of the subject are thus treated?
13. Is there a righteousness by the law, what the relation of the law to righteousness, and to whom is this righteousness offered?
14. How do you explain God's partiality toward the Jews first and then toward the Gentiles?
15. What the terms of this righteousness, and what its source?
16. What is this phase of salvation called, and what is the ground of it?
17. What is redemption, and what does it imply?
18. What the meritorious ground of our justification, and upon what does the effectiveness of it depend?
19. What the difference in the application to sins before justification and to sins after justification?
20. What is justification, where does it take place, what accompanies it in the sinner, how, what its elements and how illustrated in both the Old and the New Testaments?
21. How does this method of justification by faith enable God to remain just and at the same time justify a guilty man?
22. What J. M. Pendleton's illustration of this principle?
23. What bearing has this on the case of O. T. saints?
24. How does this plan of salvation exclude boasting?
25. What objection is raised to this method of justification, and what the answer to it?
26. How is the law honored in this method of justification?
27. What the distinction between a mere pardon of human courts and this method of pardon?
28. How does Paul prove that the plan of salvation has always been the same?
29. How does Paul show that that was the only way to make the promises sure to all the seed?
30. What the testimony of David on this point, and what its special force in this case?

XIII

THE GOSPEL PLAN OF SALVATION

Scripture: Rom. 5:1-21

THE first paragraph, 1-11, of this chapter is but an elaboration, or conclusion, of the line of argument in chapters 3 and 4. There are two leading thoughts in this paragraph: (1) God's method of induction into the grace of salvation. (2) The happy estate of the justified.

METHOD OF INDUCTION

This method is expressed thus: "Being therefore justified by faith * * * through our Lord Jesus Christ; through whom also *we have had our access by faith into this grace wherein we stand.*" A vital question is here answered—*"How do we get into Christ,* in whom are all the blessings of salvation, each in its order?" The corresponding doctrine to our getting into Christ is getting Christ *into us* to complete the union with Him as expressed by himself: "I in you * * * and you in me," John 15:4. The names of these two doctrines are—

1. Justification through faith, or *we into Christ.*
2. Regeneration through faith, or *Christ into us.*

Elsewhere the doctrine of "Christ into us" through regeneration is presented thus: "Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ, ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart,"

II Cor. 3:3. "For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," 4:6. "To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ *in you*, the hope of glory," Col. 1:27.

The proof that the method of this induction is also by faith is given by Christ. When Nicodemus asked as to the method of regeneration Christ answered, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth may in Him have eternal life," John 3:14, 15. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God: and whosoever loveth Him that begat loveth Him also that is begotten of Him," I John 5:1.

"But as many as received Him, to them gave He the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on His name: who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God," John 1:12, 13. Gal. 3:26: "For ye are all the children of God, by faith in Jesus Christ."

But the Campbellites' method of induction into Christ is by baptism, based on Gal. 3:27; the Romanist method of induction of Christ into us is through eating the Lord's supper, based by them on the words: "Take, eat, this is my body. * * * Drink, this is my blood," and on a misapplication of John 6:53: "Jesus therefore said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves." We may name this double heresy, salvation by ordinances, *i.e.*, salvation by water and material bread. The truth of these misapplied scriptures is that there is a double method of induction, viz.: We into Christ by faith, and Christ into us by faith, symbolized in the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper.

THE HAPPY ESTATE OF THE JUSTIFIED

The difference between the common and the revised versions of Romans 5:1 is a difference in the Greek of the length of one letter in one word only, *i.e.,* between a short "o" (*omikron*) and a long "o" (*Omega*), and if the text be "Echŏmen," the rendering of the common version is right: "We *have* peace with God." If it be "Echōmen," the Revision is right: "*Let us have* peace with God." The best MSS. (Alexandrian, Vatican and Siniatic) have the long ō (*Omega.*)

The value of the distinction is this: The common version would express the truth, if limited to God's sight. The justified truly have peace legally in God's eyes as soon as justified. But the danger comes in extending the meaning to our realization; we subjectively realize the peace. There is a time-difference between a fact and our cognition of that fact; as, when looking at a man half a mile off on a prairie firing a gun, the explosion precedes our perception by sight of the smoke, or of the sound by the ear. The chickens of a mover whose legs have been tied during the day, do not realize that they are free as soon as they are untied. The sensation of being tied lingers until the circulation is restored.

So one may be justified *in fact* sometime before he realizes the peace to which justification entitles, as the experience of many Christians shows. It is God's purpose that we should realize it, and the sooner the better. To affirm that our subjective perception of an external act is necessarily simultaneous with the act is to limit the existence of things to our knowledge of things. So we may express the difference between the texts of the version by saying that one is an affirmation: "We have peace," while the other is an exhortation: "Let us have peace," *i. e.,* justification now entitles to peace, but we need to lay hold of it. The

fallacy of the affirmation consists of confounding justification, which is God's act, with subjective peace, which is our experience. Objective peace, legal peace, necessarily accompanies justification, but it may not be subjective. The battle of New Orleans was fought after the treaty of peace was signed, because Sir Edward Packenham and Gen. Jackson did not know it.

I will name in order all the elements of the happy estate of the justified:

1. Peace with God.
2. Joy in hope of the glory of God.
3. Joy in tribulation, because of the series of fruits which follows.
4. The gift of the Holy Spirit.
5. The love of God shed abroad in our hearts, by that given Spirit.
6. The assurance that the justified shall be saved from the wrath to come, because:
   (a) If reconciled, when enemies, much more will He continue salvation to friends.
   (b) If reconciled through His death much more will He alive deliver us from future wrath.
7. Joy in God the Father, through whose Son we receive the reconciliation.

THE SEMINAL IDEA OF SALVATION, 5: 12-21

By a new line of argument the apostle conveys assurance of salvation to the justified, an argument based on our seminal relations to the two Adams. This great doctrine is expressed thus: "Therefore, as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned," 5: 12. "So then as through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to

condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life. For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall many be made righteous," 5:18, 19. If we combine the several thoughts into one great text we have this: By *one* offense of *one* man condemnation came upon all men. So by *one act of righteousness* of *one* Man, justification unto eternal life comes upon all men who by *one* exercise of faith lay hold on Him who wrought the one act of righteousness.

This text startlingly offends and confounds the reasonings of the carnal mind which says,

"1. One may not be justly condemned for the offense of somebody else, but only for his own offense, nor justified by the righteousness of somebody else, but by his own righteousness.

"2. Condemnation must come for all offenses, not just one, and justification must be based on all acts of righteousness, not just one.

"3. To base a man's condemnation or justification on the act of another destroys personal responsibility.

"4. The doctrine of imputing one man's guilt to a substitute tends to demoralization, in that the real sinner will sin the more, not being personally amenable to penalty.

"5. The doctrine of pardoning a guilty man because another is righteous turns loose a criminal on society.

"6. The whole of it violates that ancient law of the Bible itself: 'Thou shalt justify the innocent and condemn the guilty.'"

If the gospel plan of salvation, fairly interpreted, does destroy personal responsibility, does tend to demoralize society, does encourage to sin the more, does turn criminals loose on society, does not tend to make its subjects personally better, it is then the doctrine of the devil and should be hated and resisted by all who respect justice and depre-

cate iniquity. But the seminal idea of condemnation and justification grows out of relations to two respective heads, and it results from varieties in creation, thus:

a. God created a definite number of angels, just so many at the start, never any more or less, a company, not a family, incapable of propagation, being sexless, without ancestry or posterity, without brother or sister or other ties of consanguinity, each complete in himself, and hence no angel could be condemned or justified for another's act. The act of every angel terminates in himself. Therefore there can be no salvation for a sinning angel. And hence our Savior "took not on Him the nature of angels."

b. But God also created a different order of beings, at the start just one man, having potentially in himself an entire race—a countless multitude to be developed from him. And in propagating the race he transmitted his own nature, and through heredity his children inherited that nature. No act of any human being arises altogether from himself or can possibly terminate in himself. In considering heredity Oliver Wendell Holmes has said, "Man is an omnibus in which all his ancestors ride." Moreover, man was created to be a social being, from which fact arises the necessity of human government whether in legislative, judicial or executive power. The mind can conceive of only one human being whose act would terminate in himself, and under the following conditions alone: He must be without ancestry, without capacity of posterity, without kindred in any degree, without relation to society, living alone on an island surrounded by an ocean whose waves touched no other shore from which society might come. How much more the head in whom potentially and legally was the race could not do an act that would terminate in himself.

c. The creature cannot deny God's sovereign right to create this variety of moral beings, angels and man.

d. Nature does not exempt children from the penalty of heredity.

e. Human law neither exempts children from legal responsibility of parents nor acquits criminals because of hereditary predispositions.

The context bases the condemnation of all men on the ground that all sinned in Adam, the head, and so having sinned in him they all died in him. The context, "And so death passed unto all men" (even those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression) is the distinct proof of our proposition. Only one person ever sinned the sin of Adam and that was Adam himself, the head of the race. Now as proof that his posterity sinned, in him death passed upon all of his posterity who had not sinned after the similitude of his sin, that is, they sinned, not as the head of a race, but from depravity—an inherited depravity. Adam didn't have that inherited depravity. God made him upright. Whenever I commit a sin I don't commit that sin from the standpoint of Adam, but I commit it on account of an evil nature inherited from Adam, and that sin is not after the similitude of Adam's transgression. Moreover, if I commit a sin, the race is not held responsible for my sin, because I am not the head of the race. The race does not stand or fall in me. Thus there are two particulars in which sins which we commit are not after the similitude of Adam's sin, and yet, says the apostle, with his inexorable logic, "Though they don't sin after the similitude of Adam, yet death, the penalty of sin, passed upon every one of them." The law was executed on every one of them; they died. Sin condemns on the ground of the solidarity of the law, the unity of the law. See James 2:10: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all."

Human law in this respect conforms to divine law. If a man be law-abiding fifty years and then commits one

capital offense, his previous righteousness avails him nothing. Nor does it avail that he was innocent of all other offenses. If a man were before a court charged with murder he would derive no benefit by proving that he had not committed adultery. If he were guilty on the one point, his life is forfeited. That is on account of the solidarity of the law. Nor does it avail a man anything in a human court that he was tempted from without. So Adam vainly pleaded, "The woman tempted me and I did eat."

QUESTIONS

1. What part of chapter 5 is but an elaboration, or conclusion, of the line of argument in chapters 3 and 4?
2. What the two leading thoughts in this paragraph?
3. How is God's method of induction expressed?
4. What vital question is here answered?
5. What the corresponding doctrine to our getting into Christ?
6. What the names of these two doctrines?
7. How elsewhere is the doctrine of "Christ into us" through regeneration presented?
8. What the proof that the method of this induction is also by faith?
9. What the Campbellites' method of induction into Christ, and on what scripture based?
10. What the Romanist method of induction of Christ into us, and on what scripture based?
11. How may we name this double heresy?
12. What the truth of these misapplied scriptures?
13. What the difference between the common and the revised versions of Rom. 5:1, and what the translation in each case?
14. What the value of the distinction? Illustrate.
15. What the fallacy of affirming that subjective peace is simultaneous with justification? Illustrate.
16. What, in order, are the elements of the happy estate of the justified?
17. By what new line of argument in 5:12-21 does the apostle convey assurance of salvation to the justified?
18. In what words is this great doctrine expressed?
19. Combine the several thoughts into one great text.
20. How does this text startlingly offend and confound the reasonings of the carnal mind?
21. If the gospel plan of salvation, fairly interpreted, does destroy personal responsibility, does tend to demoralize society, does not tend to make its subjects personally better, then what?

22. What the explanation of the seminal idea of condemnation and justification growing out of the relations to the two respective heads?

23. On what ground does the context base the condemnation of all men?

24. What is the meaning of the context, "and so death passed unto all men," etc.?

25. On what ground does sin condemn, and what the proof?

26. How does human law in this respect conform to divine law?

XIV

THE SEMINAL IDEA OF SALVATION

Scripture: Rom. 5:12-21

THE one offense committed by the first Adam was his violation of that test, or prohibition, "Thou shalt not eat of the tree of death; thou shalt not experimentally know the difference between good and evil." In other words, he was an anti-prohibitionist. The law commenced with an absolute prohibition, and it didn't avail Adam a thing to plead personal liberty. Race-responsibility rested on Adam alone. It could not possibly have rested on Eve, because she was a descendant of Adam, just as much as we are. God created just one man, and in that man was the whole human race, including Eve. Later he took a part of the man and made a woman, and the meaning of the word, woman, is "derived from man." When Adam saw her he said, *"Isshah,"* woman, which literally means *derived from man.* As she got both her soul and body from the man, being his descendant, it was impossible that the race responsibility should rest on her.

If only Eve had sinned the race would not have perished. She would have perished, but not the race. The race was in Adam. God could have derived another woman from him like that one. He had the potentiality in him of all women as well as all men. Some error has arisen from holding Eve responsible, such as the error of pointing the finger at the woman and saying, "You did it!" If we have ever committed this error, let us never do it any more. The text says, "By *one* offense of one *man*" and not by one offense of one woman. That Eve sinned there is no doubt;

she was in the transgression. To the contrary, history shows that God connects salvation with the woman, and not damnation. He said, "The Seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." There we have the promise of grace. And He could not have said the seed of the man, for, if one be the seed of a man, he inherits the man's fallen nature.

This fact has a mighty bearing on the Second Adam. When the Second Adam came, the first and virtually essential proof was that a woman was His mother, but no man was His father—God was His father. If a man had been His father He would himself have been under condemnation through a depraved nature. Mary could not understand the announcement that she should become the mother of a Savior who would be the "Son of God," since she had not yet married, until the angel exclaimed: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore also the holy thing which is begotten shall be called the Son of God," Luke 1:35. Hence whoever denies our Lord's birth of a virgin and that He was sired by the Most High denies the whole plan of salvation and is both the boss-liar of the world and antichrist. The essential deity of our Lord and His incarnation constitute the bed-rock of salvation. It is the first, most vital, most fundamental truth. No man who rejects it can be a Christian or should be received as a Christian for one moment. See John 1:1, 14; I John 4:1-3; Phil. 2:6-8; I Tim. 3:16.

But this question comes up, "Did not Jesus derive His human nature, through heredity, from His mother, or since she was a descendant of fallen Adam, how could her Son escape a depraved nature?" This is a pertinent question and a very old one. It so baffled Romanist theologians that they invented and issued under papal infallibility the decree of "The Immaculate Conception," meaning not only that

Jesus was born sinless, but that Mary herself was born sinless, which of course only pushes back the difficulty one degree. Their invention was purely gratuitous. There is nothing in the case to call for a sinless mother. Depravity resides in the soul. The soul comes, not from the one who conceives, but from the one who begets. This is the very essence of the teaching in the passage cited from Luke. The sinlessness of the nature of Jesus is expressly ascribed to the Sire: "The Holy One who is begotten." And it is the very heart of Paul's entire biological, or seminal, idea of salvation, *i.e.*, life from a seed. The seed is in the sire. The first Adam's seed is unholy; the Second Adam's seed is holy. Hence the necessity of the Spirit-birth. So is our Lord's teaching in John 3:3-6; 8:44; and I John 3:9, and the parable of the tares with its explanation, Matt. 13:24-30, 36-43, and especially I Peter 1:23: "Having been begotten again, not of *corruptible seed,* but of *incorruptible.*" The propriety of salvation by the Second Adam lies in the fact that we were lost through the first Adam. All the criticism against substitutionary, or vicarious, salvation comes from a disregard of this truth.

Christ met all the law-requirements as follows:

1. By holiness of nature—starting holy.
2. By obeying all its precepts.
3. By fulfilling its types.
4. By paying its penalty.

The value of the first three items is that they qualified Him to do the fourth. If He had been either unholy in nature or defective in obedience He would have been amenable to the penalty for himself. But holiness in His own nature and His perfect obedience exempting Him from penalty on His own account, He could be the sinner's substitute in death and judgment: "Him who knew no sin, God made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in Him," II Cor. 5:21. "Ye

were redeemed * * * with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot," I Pet. 1:18, 19. If He answered not to the types, He could not be the Messiah.

Christ's one act of righteousness, which is the sole ground of our justification, is His vicarious death on the cross. No one ought to preach at all—having no gospel message—if he does not comprehend this with absolute definiteness. If we attribute our justification to Christ's holiness, or to His preceptive obedience, or to His Sermon on the Mount, or to His miracles, or to His kingly or priestly reign in heaven, where He is now, or if we locate that one act of righteousness anywhere in the world except in one place and in one particular deed we ought not to preach.

The one act of righteousness—the sole meritorious ground of justification—is *our Lord's vicarious death on the cross,* suffering the death-penalty of divine law against sin.

This death was a real sacrifice and propitiation God-ward, so satisfying the law's penal sanctions in our behalf as to make it just for God to justify the ungodly. Our Lord's incarnation, with all His work antecedent to the cross, was but preparatory to it, and all His succeeding work consequential. His exaltation to the throne in heaven, His priestly intercession, and His coming judgment flowing from His "obedience unto the death of the cross," Phil. 2:8,9.

The particular proof of this one act of righteousness from both Testaments is as follows:

1. Proof from the Old Testament: (1) The establishment of the throne of grace, immediately after man's expulsion from paradise, where God dwelt between the cherubim, east of the Garden of Eden, as a Schechinah, or Sword-flame, to keep open the way to the tree of life (Gen. 3:24) and was there acceptably approached only through the blood of an innocent and substitutionary sacrifice (Gen. 4:3-5; compare Rev. 7:14; 22:14), which mercy-seat between the cherubim was to be approached through sacrificial blood,

just as described in that part of the Mosaic law prescribing the way of the sinner's approach to God (Ex. 25:17-22).

2. In the four most marvelous types:

A. The Passover-lamb whose blood availed *when Jehovah saw it* (Ex. 12:13,23) showing that the blood propitiated God-ward. See I Cor. 5:7.

B. In the kid on the great day of atonement (Lev. 16) which shows that the expiatory blood must be sprinkled on the mercy seat between the cherubim as the basis of atonement.

C. In the red heifer, burned without the camp, and whose ashes, liquefied with water, became a portable means of purification, Num. 19:2-6, 9, 17, 18, with Heb. 9:13, representing that first and cleansing element of regeneration in which the Holy Spirit applies Christ's blood. See Psa. 51:2,7; Ezek. 36:25; Jno. 3:5 (born of water and Spirit); Eph. 5:26; Tit. 3:5.

D. The brazen serpent, fused in fire and then elevated to be seen, which shows that the expiatory passion, a fiery suffering, must be lifted up in preaching, as the object of faith and means of healing, Num. 21:9, explained in John 3:14-16; 12:32,33; Gal. 3:1.

3. In such striking passages as Isa. 53:4-11. Compare the Messianic prayer: "Deliver my soul from the sword," Psa. 22:20, with the divine response, "Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith Jehovah," Zech. 13:7, and hear the sufferer's outcry: "My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Psa. 22:1 and Matt. 27:45,46. When these passages are compared with Isa. 53:5-10, Rom. 3:25, II Cor. 5:21 and I Pet. 2:24, it cannot be reasonably questioned that He died under the sentence of God's law against sin, and that this death was propitiatory toward God and vicarious toward man, and is the one act of righteousness through which our justification comes.

2. Some of the New Testament passages, including several already given, are our Lord's own words in instituting the memorial supper: "This is my body given *for you.* * * * This cup is the New Covenant in my blood * * * even that which is poured out *for you* * * * which is shed *for many* unto remission of sins." We need to add only Rom. 3:25, I Cor. 1:30, 5:7, I Pet. 1:18, 19, 2:24, and Heb. 10:4-14.

The combined text, "One exercise of faith," means that unlike sanctification, justification is not progressive, but one instantaneous act; God justifies, and our laying hold of it is a simple definite transaction. One moment we are not justified; in the next moment we are justified. One look at the brazen serpent brought healing. Zacchæus went up the tree lost, and came down saved. The dying thief at one moment was lost, and the next heard the words: "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise." At midnight the lost jailer was trembling; just after that he was rejoicing believing in God with all his house. There is no appreciable time-element in the transition from condemnation to justification.

Considering Christ as a gift, how long does it take to receive Him? Considering Him as a promise, how long to trust? Considering Christ as the custodian of an imperilled soul, how long to commit it to Him? Considering the union between Christ and the sinner as an espousal (II Cor. 11:12) *how long to say: "I take Him?"*

As a marriage between man and woman is a definite transaction, consummated when he says, "I take her to be my lawful wife," and when she says, "I take him to be my lawful husband," so by one exercise of faith we take Christ as our Lord. But as sanctification is progressive, we go on in that from faith to faith. But justification through faith in a substitute does not turn loose a criminal on society. If it be meant a criminal in deed, it is not true,

because to the last farthing the law-claim has been met in the payment of the surety. In other words, the law has been fully satisfied. If it be meant in spirit, it is not true, for every justified man is regenerated. A new heart to love God and man has been given, a holy disposition imparted, loving righteousness and hating iniquity. A spirit of obedience, new and mighty motives of gratitude and love are at work, and motive determines very largely the moral quality of action. In other words, the justified man is also a new creature.

It secure in the new creature the only basis of true morality. Morality is conformity with moral law. Immorality is non-conformity with moral law. The first and great commandment of moral law is supreme love toward God, and the second is love to thy neighbor as thyself. No unregenerate man can make a step in either direction any more than a bad tree can produce good fruit, for "the carnal mind in enmity against God and not subject to His law, neither indeed can be." The unregenerate is self-centered; the regenerate, Christ-centered. The justified man, being regenerate, will be necessarily a better man personally and practically than he was before in every relation of life—better in the family, better in society and better in the state. A claim to justification without improvement in these directions is necessarily a false claim.

The writer in 2:17 has already introduced the word, "law," in a special sense when discussing the case of the Jew as contradistinguished from other nations. And this is the sense of his word, "law," when he says, "For until the law sin was in the world." Law, to a Jew, meant the Sinaitic law. But the apostle is proving that law did not originate at Sinai, in any sense except for one nation, as was evident from sin and death anterior to it. First, there was primal law inhering in God's intent in creating moral

beings, and in the very constitution of their being, and in all their relations. And this law, even to Adam in innocence, found statutory expression in the law of labor, the law of marriage and in the law of the Sabbath, as well as in the particular prohibition concerning the tree of death. Immediately after Adam's fall and expulsion from Paradise came the intervention of the grace-covenant, with its law of sacrifices, symbolically showing the way of a sinner's approach to God through vicarious expiation. There were preachers and prophets of grace before the flood, as well as the convicting and regenerating Spirit. All these expressions of law passed over the flood with Noah, with several express additions to the statutory law both civil and criminal. Death proved sin, and sin proved law, before we come to Sinai. Adam was under law. Adam sinned and death reigned over him. Adam's descendants down to Moses died. Therefore they had sinned, and therefore were under the law. But their sin was not like Adam's in several particulars: (1) They did not sin as the head of a race. (2) They did not sin from a standpoint of innocence and holiness, but from an inherited depravity. (3) They sinned under a grace-covenant which Adam had not in Paradise. This last particular is here emphasized, where grace in justification is contrasted with the condemnation through Adam's one offense.

If then the Sinaitic code did not originate law, what was its purpose? "The law came in besides, that the trespass might abound." This purpose of the law will be considered more elaborately later. Just here it is sufficient to say that the Sinaitic code under three great departments, or heads, is the most marvelous and elaborate expression of law known to history. Its three heads, or constituent elements, as we learn in the Old Testament, are—

1. The decalogue, or moral law, or God and the normal man.

2. The law of the altar, or God and the sinner, or the sinner's symbolic way of approach to God, including a place to find Him, a means of propitiating Him, times to approach Him, and an elaborate ritual of service.

3. The judgments, or God and the State, in every variety of municipal, civil and criminal law.

So broad, so deep, so high, so minute, so comprehensive is this code, so bright is its light, that every trespass in thought, word and deed is not only made manifest, but is made to abound, in order that where sin abounded grace would abound exceedingly.

QUESTIONS

1. What was the one offense committed by the first Adam?
2. On whom did race-responsibility rest, Adam or Eve, or both, and why?
3. If only Eve had sinned, what would have been the result?
4. What error has since arisen from holding Eve responsible?
5. What to the contrary does history show?
6. What bearing has this fact on the Second Adam?
7. How could Jesus, being born of a depraved woman, escape a depraved nature?
8. What the propriety of salvation by the Second Adam?
9. How did Christ meet all the law requirements?
10. What the value of the first three items?
11. What Christ's one act of righteousness, which is the sole ground of our justification?
12. What particular proof of this one act of righteousness from both Testaments?
13. What does the combined text mean by "one exercise of faith?"
14. How is it that justification through faith in a substitute does not turn loose a criminal on society?
15. How then is it that it does not demoralize?
16. Explain the parenthetic statement in 5 : 13-17 and also 5 : 20, 21.
17. If the Sinaitic code did not originate the law, what was its purpose?
18. What the three constituent elements of the Sinaitic law?

XV

SALVATION IN US

Scripture: Rom. 6:1—8:39

WE have considered hitherto in this letter what salvation has done for us in redemption, justification and adoption. We have now before us in 6:1—8:39 what salvation does in us in regeneration and sanctification of our souls, and in the resurrection and glorification of our bodies.

Two questions properly introduce this section. In 3:21 he says, "But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets." In view of this, in 6:1 he asks, "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?" The meaning is this: Does salvation by grace through faith in a debt-paying substitute encourage to more sin, because the sinner does not himself pay the penalty, and thus by more sin give greater scope to superabounding grace? Or, does imputation of the penalty of sin in a substitute make void the law to the sinner personally? Or does God's justification of the sinner, through faith, instead of his personal obedience, turn loose a defiled criminal on society eager to commit more crime because his future offenses, like his past offenses, will be charged to the substitute? These are pertinent questions of practical importance and if, indeed, this be the legitimate result of the gospel plan of salvation, it is worthy of rejection by all who love justice.

While we have already considered this matter somewhat, let us restate a reply embodying the substance of this sec-

tion. The reply is in substance as follows: Whom God justifies them He also regenerates and sanctifies in soul and raises and glorifies in body. In the first element of regeneration—the application of the blood of Christ by the Holy Spirit—the sinner is cleansed from the *defilement* of sin. See Psa. 51:2, 7; Ezek. 36:25; Tit. 3:5, first clause. "The washing of regeneration," Eph. 5:26; "born of water," John 3:5, all of which is set forth in the type of the red heifer, Heb. 9:13, 14, an Old Testament teaching for ignorance of which Christ condemned Nicodemus, John 3:10. See also Rev. 7:14 and 22:14, revised version. So that the justified man is not turned loose a defiled criminal on society.

In the second element of regeneration the justified sinner is delivered from the *love* of sin by his renewed nature, Psa. 51:10; Ezek. 36:26; John 3:3, 5, 6, "born from above * * * born of the Spirit;" Tit. 3:5, second clause, "and renewing of the Holy Spirit." So that the regenerate man has the spirit of obedience, Ezek. 36:27; Tit. 2:11-14; 3:8. And while the obedience of the regenerate is imperfect, yet through sanctification, when it is consummated, the regenerate in soul is qualified to perfect obedience, Phil. 1:6; 3:12-14; II Cor. 3:17, 18. And when the body is raised and glorified then this justified sinner has become personally, in soul and body, as holy and obedient as Jesus himself, I John 3:2; Psa. 17:15, all of which is pictorially set forth in our baptism, Rom. 6:4, 5; Col. 2:12. So that faith not only does not make void the law to us personally, but is the only way by which we shall be made able to keep the law personally, and not only does not encourage to sin, but furnishes the only motives by which practically we cease from sin.

The doctrine of baptism as bearing upon this point set forth in 6:1-11 is this: A justified and regenerate man is commanded to be baptized. Baptism symbolizes the burial

of a dead man—dead to his old life—his cleansing from the sins of the old life, and his resurrection to a new life. Christ died on the cross for our sins once for all. Being dead He was buried, raised to a new life and exalted to a royal and priestly throne. All this, in the beginning of His public ministry, was prefigured in His own baptism. As He died for our sins, paying the law-penalty, so we in regeneration become dead to law-claims because we died to sin in His death. Being dead to the old life, we should be buried. This is represented in our baptism: "Buried in baptism." But in regeneration we are not only slain, but made alive, or quickened. The living should not abide in the grave, therefore in our baptism there is also a symbol of our resurrection. But regeneration not only slays and makes alive, but cleanses, therefore in our baptism we are symbolically cleansed from sin, as was said to Paul, "Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins." So that not only both elements of regeneration, cleansing and renewal of soul are set forth pictorially in our baptism, but also the coming resurrection and glorification of our bodies.

In 6:7 we have this language: "For he that hath died is justified from sin." That means that there are two ways in which one can satisfy the law and meet all of its claims. He can either do it by perfectly obeying the law, or he can do it by meeting the penalty of the law. Therefore it says, "He that hath died is justified from sin." It is just like an ordinary debt. If one pays the debt he is justified from the claim. If a man commits an offense and the law-decision is that he suffer the penalty of two years in the penitentiary, and he serves the two years in the penitentiary, he is justified in the eyes of the law. The law can't take him up and try him again. While the disobedience of the law is not justified in obedience, he has paid the full penalty. Now to make the application of that: Christ died for our sins; we died in His death, just as we died in Adam and

came under condemnation for it. Now when we die with Christ, that death on the cross justifies us from sin. That is what it means.

The next point is the argument from the meaning of the declaration that he that is dead is justified from sin. That argument is presented in verses 12 and 13, and the reason for it is given in verse 14. Let us look at those verses. If we be dead to sin we should not let sin reign in our mortal body that we should obey the lusts thereof. Neither present our members unto sin as instruments of unrighteousness, but present ourselves unto God as alive from the dead, and our members as instruments of righteousness unto God. The reason assigned is, "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under law, but under grace." In other words, "It is true that you didn't pay that law-claim, but your Substitute paid it, and that puts you from under the law of condemnation. Now if you set out to pay, you set out to pay unto grace. The spirit of obedience in you is not of fear, but of love to Him that died for you." That is what is called being under grace in a matter of obedience and not under law.

What is the force of the question, "Shall we sin because we are not under law, but under grace?" In other words, "Because my obedience is not a condition of my salvation, shall I therefore sin?" That is the thought, and his argument against that is this: "God forbid. Know ye not that to whom ye present yourselves as servants unto obedience, his servants ye are whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" If a man presents himself unto grace as the principle of obedience, then it is not a life and death matter, but it is a matter of love and gratitude. It is on a different principle entirely. And in a very elaborate way he continues the argument down to verse 23: "For the wages of sin is death; but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Let us now explain the contrast in 6:23 and give the argument. Here he contrasts two things, (1) the wages. This is a matter of law—wages. (2) Over against that stands gift—free gift. That is not a matter of wages. The wages of sin is death—that is the penalty—but now the free gift is eternal life. It is impossible to put his meaning any plainer than these words put it: "Are you expecting to be saved on the ground of earning your salvation as wages, or are you expecting to be saved through the free gift of God unto eternal life?" That is the thought.

Let us see the force of the illustration in 7:2: "For the woman that hath a husband is bound by law to the husband while he liveth; but if the husband die, she is discharged from the law of the husband. So then if, while the husband liveth, she be joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if the husband die, she is free from the law, so that she is no adulteress, though she be joined to another man." The force of that as an illustration of the married life is: "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder." The obligation of a wife to a husband, and their fidelity to each other, is a matter of law growing out of the relation that holds them together. So long as a husband lives and a wife lives, neither one of them can be free to marry except in a certain case, and that exception is discussed elsewhere. He is just discussing the general principles here. Now apply that illustration: "The law holds you to absolute fidelity in obedience just as the law holds the woman bound to her husband, and the husband to his wife. If you died with Christ, you are dead to that law, and therefore you can enter into another relation. You are espoused to Christ. The law that binds you now is the law of that espousal to Christ, and that is the law of freedom; not like the other, it is a matter of grace." That is the force of that statement.

Then in 7:7, "Is the law sin?" That is an important

question and he answers it. Some things in connection with it have already been answered, and in answering it particularly I will take the following position: (1) The law is not sin. It is holy, it is just, it is good. What, then, is the relation of the law to sin? He says here that it gives the knowledge of sin: "I had not known sin except through the law." If people were living according to different standards, every man being a judge in his own case, what A would think to be right B would think to be wrong, and *vice versa.* People would think conflicting things, and as long as a man held himself to be judge of what was right and what was wrong he would not feel that he was a sinner. So the real standard, not a sliding scale, is put down among all the varying ideas of right and wrong. What is the object? It is to reveal the lack of conformity to the law: "I had not known sin, except through the law." (2) The second reason is that it provokes to sin. He says, "Sin, finding occasion, through the commandment beguiled me, and through it slew me." If children were forbidden to climb telephone poles they would all desire to climb them, and they would never think of it if they were not forbidden. So that law was designed to show just what inherent nature will bring out. A snake is very pretty at certain times, and one may think that the enmity between him and the human race is hardly justifiable, but let him give a snake the opportunity to develop just what is in him, and then he will have a different opinion. Who would have supposed that it was in human nature to do the things done in the French Revolution? Man is a good sort of creature; he would not impale a body on a bayonet; he would not burn a woman at the stake; he would not put their fingers in a thumb-screw; he would not put a man on the rack and torture him; but nobody knows the evil that is in human nature until it has a chance to show what is in it. The law brings all that out; hence, (3) the object of the

law is to make sin appear to be sin, and to be exceeding sinful—to make it seem what it is, and not just a peccadillo, or a misdemeanor, but an exceedingly vile, ghastly and hateful thing. (4) Then the object of the law is to work death: "Sin, taking occasion by the law, beguiled and slew me." The death there referred to is the death in one's own mind. It means conviction that one is lost—that is the death he is talking about. For he explains immediately, where he says, "I was alive apart from the law once," that is, he felt like he was all right, but when the commandment came he saw that he was a dead man—under condemnation of death. And that is one of the works of the Holy Spirit bringing about conviction, making a man see that he is a sinner, making him feel that he is a sinner, that he is exceeding sinful.

And we may distrust any kind of preaching that is dry-eyed, that has no godly sorrow, that has no repentance. If one thinks that he is a very little sinner, then a very little Savior is needed. We depreciate our Savior just to the extent that we extenuate our sin.

The next passage is also of real importance, 7:15-25. There is only one important question on it: "Is the experience there related the experience of a converted man, or of an unconverted man?" If one wants to see how men dissent on it, let him read his commentaries.

Let us see some of the points: "That which I do I know not [the word, "know," is used in the sense of approve]; for not what I would, that do I practise; but what I hate, that I do. But if what I would not, that I do, I consent unto the law that it is good. So now it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me. * * * For the good which I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I practise. But if what I would not, that I do, it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me. I find then the law, that, to me who would do good, evil is present. For I

delight in the law of God after the inward man." Now is that a saved or an unsaved man? Our Methodist brethren tell us that that is the experience of an unsaved man; that we don't get to conversion until we come to chapter 8. I say that there we strike sanctification. The point is this: If the mind of the flesh—the carnal mind—is enmity against God, if it is not subject to the law of God, and neither indeed can be, then how can that mind, "delight in the law of God in the inward man?" How can he approve that which is good? From verse 16 to the end of chapter 7 he discusses a certain imperfection attending the regenerate state. The experience of every regenerate man will corroborate this: "I know a certain thing is right; I am ashamed to say I didn't do it; I know a certain thing is wrong, and I approve the law that makes it wrong, and I am ashamed to say I have done that very thing." And if there is one thing that disturbs the Christian and troubles him, it is to find a law in his members warring against the law of his mind. That is expressed here: "Wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?" That expression of Paul's has been (and I think rightly) supposed to refer to an ancient penalty inflicted on a man that had committed a certain offense. He was chained to a dead body, and he had to carry that dead body with him everywhere he went. He alive, that body dead, he would want a pure atmosphere to inhale, and that body would be exhaling the stench of corruption. It was a miserable condition: "Who will deliver me from this body of death?"

One of the great French preachers preached on that subject before Louis XIV. We find a reference to it in Strong's "Systematic Theology." He was talking about the two "I's;" "that which *I* approve *I* do not; that which *I* would not do that *I* do." And the French preacher was pointing out the two men in a man, and how they fought

against each other, and the king interrupted him in his sermon and said, "Ah, I know those two men." The preacher pointed at him and said, "Sire, it is somewhat to know them, but, your majesty, one or the other of them must die." It isn't enough just to know them; one or the other of them is going to ultimately triumph.

What is the meaning of 8:4: "That the ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit?" Here is the fulfillment in us. It is not imputed righteousness that is being discussed here; that is justification. But it is the object of regeneration and sanctification to make a personal righteousness. The object of regeneration and sanctification is that *in us* the law might be fulfilled as well as *for us* in the death of Christ. That is the meaning of the passage, and it is one of the profoundest gratifications to me that my salvation does not stop at justification. I am glad to think that the law has no claims on me, but I could not be happy, being only justified and loving sin. I not only want to be delivered from sin but from the love of sin in regeneration, and the dominion of sin in sanctification.

The apostle describes the two minds in 8:5-8: "For they that are after the flesh mind the things of the flesh." Here flesh does not mean the body. The flesh does not mean the tissues and the blood. That would constitute only a physical man. What he means by the flesh is the carnal mind. Now he is discussing the two. He continues: "But they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit." There are the two minds: "For the mind of the flesh is death; but the mind of the Spirit is life and peace: because the mind of the flesh is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be; they that are in the flesh cannot please God." It is just like trying to wash away the soul's sins in water.

We might take the sinner up and hold him under Niagara Falls and let it pour on him for ten thousand years and we

could never wash away the soul's sins. It was impossible for the blood of bullocks to take away sin. It is impossible for the water of baptism to take away sin. This carnal mind cannot be made into a Christian. We can whitewash it, and there are many preachers that do that sort of business. It may be outwardly beautiful, like a tomb, but inwardly it is full of rottenness and dead men's bones.

QUESTIONS

1. What has been considered in this letter hitherto?
2. What now before us in 6:1—8-39?
3. What two questions properly introduce this section, and what their meaning?
4. What of the significance of these questions?
5. What the reply to them embodying the substance of this section?
6. What the doctrine of baptism bearing upon this point set forth in 6:1-11?
7. What the meaning of 6:7: "He that hath died is justified from sin?"
8. What the argument based upon that statement?
9. What the force of the question, "Shall we sin because we are not under law, but under grace?"
10. What the contrast and argument in 6:23?
11. What is the illustration in 7:2, and what the force of it?
12. Is the law sin? If not, what its relation to sin?
13. Expound the passage, 7:15-25.
14. What is the meaning and application of 8:4?
15. How does the apostle describe the two minds, and what the teaching?

XVI

SALVATION IN US
(Continued)

Scripture: Rom. 6:1—8:39

IN this chapter we will continue the discussion of salvation in us, or regeneration, sanctification, and glorification. Regeneration is a change of mind. The carnal mind cannot be made into a Christian, hence there must be a change. Is the change simply using the old mind, but modifying it, or is it a change like this: A woman put her baby in the cradle at night and the next morning there was another baby in the cradle which she called the changeling? That was not any imitation of the baby that was in there before. Just so we waste our time if we try to make a Christian out of the carnal mind. We can't do it. That is why regeneration is called a creation, which is to make something out of nothing—not out of a material having already existed.

What Paul is expressing here is that we may take the fallen nature of man which he has inherited from Adam and commence an educational process in the cradle, and continue it up to the adult stage and get a very respectable church member, but not a saved person.

Education has no creative power at all. He may be very proper in his behavior; he may pay the preacher; he may go to Sunday school; he may do everything in the world that will enable him to appear to be a Christian, and yet not be a Christian. There must be a breaking up of the

fallow ground. As Jesus said to Nicodemus, "Except ye be born from above, ye cannot even see the kingdom of heaven."

The conclusion reached by the apostle in this argument is in verse 11: "If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall give life also to your mortal bodies through His Spirit that dwelleth in you." Now the question, Who shall deliver me from the body of this death, this evil mind, this evil body? It comes through Christ, but it is Christ working through the Spirit. It is the Holy Spirit that made Christ's body alive; it is the Holy Spirit that will make our bodies alive at the resurrection; it is the Holy Spirit that will glorify these bodies and when they come out they will be spiritual bodies and not carnal bodies.

There is a test presented in verse 14: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God." Who are God's children? Those that have the Spirit—those that are led by the Spirit. We are regenerated by the Spirit, and under the guidance of that Spirit we turn away from sin. If we fall we try to fall toward heaven, and get up and try again. There is a sense of wanting to get nearer and nearer to God. We want to know whether we are Christians. Here is the test: We are led by the Spirit of God.

That brings us to the word, "adoption." What is adoption? Etymologically it is that legal process by which one, not a member of a family naturally, is legally made a member of it and an heir. There are three kinds of adoption which the apostle discusses in this letter: (1) National adoption, Romans 9:4: "My kinsman according to the flesh who are Israelites, whose is the adoption." Many times in the Old Testament Israel is called God's son, the nation as a nation being His particular people.

2. The adoption of the soul of the justified man, Rom. 8:15: "Ye received the spirit of adoption."

3. The adoption of our bodies when they are redeemed from the grave and glorified, Rom. 8:23: "Waiting for our adoption, towit, the redemption of our body."

The fact of our adoption is certified to us in Rom. 8:15, 16: "For ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God." That is a matter of our subjective experience. As in the case of justification there must be a difference of time between the fact of our justification and our realization of its privileges, so there must be and indeed often is a difference in time between the fact of our adoption and our realization in experience that we are adopted. The cry, "Abba, Father," means that in our experience a filial feeling toward God comes into the heart. Antecedent to this when we thought of God He seemed to us to be distant and dreadful, but when through the Holy Spirit given unto us came this conscious realization that God is a Father, it drove out all fear.

We do not feel ourselves under bondage to law, but we have the sense in our hearts of being God's children, and as a little child readily approaches a parent in expectation of either help or comfort, we have this feeling toward our heavenly Father. It is one of the sweetest experiences of the Christian life. There is no distinction of meaning between the spirit of adoption and the Spirit's bearing witness with our spirit that we are the children of God, or if there is a distinction it is not appreciable in our consciousness, since it is the Spirit that bestows that filial feeling.

As an illustration of this filial feeling in the heart I cite a story of the west well known to our boys. While two children, a little boy and his sister, were playing, the boy

was stolen by the Indians and reared among them until he caught the spirit of an Indian and gloried in the Indian life. Finally he became chief of the tribe. In a war between his tribe and the white people, he was captured and it was discovered that he was not an Indian but a white man. Finally the proof accumulated as to who were his parents, yet he refused to acknowledge them. With the sullenness of a captured Indian he pined away for the wigwams and the freedom of his Indian life. Every effort to make him realize that he was a white man failed until his sister, then a grown woman, brought the toys with which the two were playing when the boy was stolen. As he looked at them his memory awakened and he stretched out his hands and claimed them as his and said, "Where is my mother?" Now here in him was a consciousness of filial feeling towards his parents from whom he had been so long alienated. Analogous to this very impression is our experience that God is our Father.

In a vivid way the apostle represents the earth, man's habitat, as entering sympathetically into man's longing for his complete restoration to God's favor through adoption, Rom. 8:20-23: "For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only so, but ourselves also, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, towit, the redemption of our body," the meaning of which is that this earth was made for man; to him was given dominion over it, but when he sinned the earth was cursed. In the language of the scripture, "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in toil shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and

thistles shall it bring forth to thee; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." In Isa. 55:12, 13, we have this vivid imagery following conversion: "The mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing; and all of the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir-tree; and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree; and it shall be to Jehovah for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off." In other words, the joy that is in the heart of the Christian constitutes a medium of rose-color through which all creation seems to him more beautiful than it was before. The birds sing sweeter, the flowers exhale a sweeter perfume, the stars shine brighter, all of which is a sign, or forecast, of the redemption of the earth from the curse when man's redemption is complete. This curse as originally pronounced upon the earth was not through any fault of creation, as our text says: "Subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of him who had subjected it in hope." And very impressive and vivid is the imagery that the groaning of the earth is as travail, waiting to be redeemed from the defilement and scars and crimson stains that have been put upon it through man's inhumanity to man on account of sin.

Other scriptures very clearly show that this redemption of the earth accompanies the redemption of man. As the earth was cleansed from defilement of sin practiced by the antediluvians through the flood, so at the coming of our Lord and the resurrection of our bodies it will be purged by fire. The language of the Apostle Peter upon this subject is very impressive: "For this they willfully forget that there were heavens from of old, and an earth compacted out of water and amidst water, by the Word of God; by which means the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished; but the heavens that now are and the earth, by the same word have been stored up for fire,

being reserved against the day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men. * * * But the day of the Lord will come as a thief: in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing that these things are thus all to be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy living and godliness, looking for and earnestly desiring the coming of the day of God, by reason of which the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? But according to His promise, we look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness," II Pet. 3:5-7, and verses 10-13. In John's apocalypse, referring to the restitution of all things after the judgment, he says, "I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away; and the sea is no more," Rev. 21:1. This is the day of fire referred to in Mal. 4:1-3: "For, behold, the day cometh, it burneth as a furnace; and all the proud, and all that work wickedness, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith Jehovah of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. But unto you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in His wings; and ye shall go forth, and gambol as calves of the stall. And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I make, saith Jehovah of hosts." This is the day of fire which the Apostle Paul says shall try every man's work: "But if any man buildeth on the foundation gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay, stubble; each man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it is revealed in fire; and the fire itself shall prove each man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work shall abide which he built thereon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he

shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as through fire," I Cor. 3:12-15.

In continuation of the theme of this section the apostle further shows the power of the work of salvation in us through the Holy Spirit—the Paraclete. But the Greek word, "Paraclete," needs to be defined. While our Lord was on the earth He was the Paraclete, to whom as the Paraclete the disciples said, "Lord, teach us to pray," and in many examples of His own praying and in many special lessons on prayer He taught the disciples, and they were sad at heart when at the last supper He announced His speedy going away from them, but comforted them with the assurance that He would pray the Father to send them another Paraclete—the Holy Spirit, who would teach them to pray acceptably. Prayers not according to the will of God are not answered. We may ask for things, being in doubt as to whether it is God's will that such things should be granted, but the Holy Spirit is not in doubt. He knows what is according to the will of God, and hence when He moves us intensely to offer prayers those prayers will always be according to God's will, and so will be answered. Thus While Jesus in heaven makes intercession *for* us before the Mercy Seat, the other Paraclete—the Holy Spirit—here on earth makes intercession *in* us. We are not to understand that the Holy Spirit directly prays for the Christian, but His method of intercession is to prompt us to make the right intercession, and it is in that way that He makes intercession for us. He teaches us how to pray, and what to pray for. That is why great revivals of religion are in connection with these spiritual prayers offered by God's people. Hence the prophet says, "Thorns and briers shall come up on the land of my people till the Spirit is poured out from on high."

The most vivid illustration of the thought is found in the prophecy of Zechariah in connection with an event yet

in the future, towit, the salvation of the Jewish nation. The language is,

"And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication; and they shall look unto me whom they have pierced; and they shall mourn for Him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for Him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born. In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Meggidon. And the land shall mourn, every family apart; the family of the houses of David apart, and their wives apart; the family of the house of Nathan apart, and their wives apart; the family of the house of Levi apart, and their wives apart; the family of the Shimeites apart, and their wives apart; all the families that remain, every family apart, and their wives apart. In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness." Zech. 12:10—13:1.

It is on account of the Spirit's intercession in us that backsliders are ever reclaimed. As we wander away from God we lose the spirit of prayer, and while we go through with the forms of prayer we are conscious that our prayers do not rise, do not take hold of the throne of God, but when the Spirit comes upon the backslider then his hard heart is melted, the fountain of his tears is unsealed, the spirit of grace and supplication comes upon him, and he is conscious that he is taking hold of the throne of mercy in his prayers.

As an illustration, many Texans have experienced the hardships of a long-continued drouth, when the heavens seem to be brass and the earth seems to be iron. When vegetation dies, when dust chokes the traveler on the thoroughfare, and thirst consumes him, suddenly he comes to a well and in it is an old-fashioned pump. He leaps down from his horse, rushes to this pump, but in moving its handle he causes only a dry rattle. The reason is, that through very long disuse and heat the valves of the pump have shrunk and hence cannot make suction to draw up the water. In such case water must be poured down the pump until the valves are swollen, and then as the pump-

handle is worked, suction draws the water as freely as at first. As that pouring the water from above down the dry pump is to its efficacy in bringing water up, so is the Spirit's intercession in us, causing us to pray successfully and according to the will of God. In that way the two elements of the gospel plan of salvation co-operate to the everlasting security of the believer. At the heaven-end of the line Jesus, the first Advocate, or Paraclete, makes intercession for us as High Priest, pleading what His expiation has done for us, while the Holy Spirit, the second Advocate, or Paraclete, works in us an intercession for us here on earth. So that both ends of the line are secure in heaven above and on earth beneath. No backslider has ever been able to work himself into the true spirit of prayerfulness any more than a dry pump can be made to bring up water by working the handle. Whenever he does pray prevailingly, it is when the Spirit works in him the grace of supplication.

QUESTIONS

1. What is regeneration? negatively and positively?
2. What the real import of what Paul says about it?
3. What the conclusion reached by Paul in this argument?
4. What is the test presented in 8:14?
5. What is adoption?
6. What the three kinds of adoption which the apostle discusses in this letter?
7. How is the fact of our adoption certified to us?
8. What is the meaning of the soul's cry, "Abba, Father?"
9. Is there any distinction between the spirit of adoption and the Spirit's bearing witness with our spirit that we are the children of God? If so, what?
10. Illustrate the filial feeling that comes to us when we are saved?
11. In what vivid way does Paul represent the earth, man's habitat, as entering sympathetically into man's longing for his complete restoration to God's favor through adoption?
12. What other scriptures very clearly show this redemption of the earth accompanying the redemption of man?
13. In continuation of the theme of this section, how does the apostle further show the power of the work of salvation in us?
14. Expound and illustrate this passage?

XVII

THE FINAL WORK OF SALVATION IN US

Scripture: Rom. 6:1—8:39

THE final work of salvation in us is expressed in Romans 8:23—the redemption of our body concerning which he adds: "For in hope were we saved: but hope that is seen is not hope: for who hopeth for that which he seeth? But if we hope for that which we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." The body is an essential part of the normal man, who was made dual in nature, and even in Paradise God had provided for the elimination of the mortality of man's body, through the continued eating of the tree of life. But the immortality of the body in sin would have been an unspeakable curse to man, and hence God, in expelling man from the garden, said, "Lest he put forth his hand and take of the tree of life and live forever." But when our souls are regenerated the hope enters the heart that the body also will be saved, and we wait patiently for that part of our salvation. While the meaning of a passage in Job is somewhat disputable, the author believes that the common version is correct. It expresses the idea of Job in these words:

"Oh, that my words were now written!
Oh, that they were inscribed in a book!
That with an iron pen and lead
They were graven in the rock forever!
But as for me, I know that my Redeemer liveth,
And that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth:
And though after my skin worms destroy this body,
Yet in my flesh shall I see God.
Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold,
And not another: though my reins be consumed within me."
Job, 19:23-27.

And the passage is akin to the expression in Psalm 17: "I will be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness." This harmonizes with another very striking passage in Job:

"For there is hope of a tree,
If it be cut down, that it will sprout again,
And that the tender branch thereof will not cease.
Though the root thereof wax old in the earth,
And the stock thereof die in the ground;
Yet through the scent of water it will bud,
And put forth boughs like a plant.
But a man dieth, and is laid low:
Yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?
As the waters fail from the sea,
And the river wasteth and drieth up;
So man lieth down and riseth not:
Till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake,
Nor be roused out of their sleep.
Oh, that thou wouldst hide me in Sheol,
That thou wouldst keep me secret, until thy wrath be past,
That thou wouldst appoint me a set time, and remember me!
If a man die, shall he live again?
All the days of my warfare would I wait,
Till my release should come.
Thou wouldst call, and I would answer thee:
Thou wouldst have a desire to the work of thy hands." Job, 14:7-15.

Here Job is deeply impressed with the hope of a tree cut down reviving. There is a resurrection for it, but he says, "When a man dies, where is he [that is, as to his soul] and if a man die shall he [as to his body] live again?" Inasmuch as the body was the work of God's hands and originally intended to be immortal, he expresses the hope that God would hide him in the grave and appoint a set time to remember him there and then desire the work of His hands and call him forth from his long sleep.

The fulness of the salvation in us is the regeneration of the soul, its ultimate sanctification, and the resurrection and glorification of the body. It has ever been impossible to satisfy the cravings of a human heart with the hope of soul-salvation only. It is ingrained in the very constitution of our being that we long for the revivification of the body. A bird escaping from its shell to fly with a new life in the

air cares nothing for the cast-off shell. A butterfly emerging from the chrysalis-state cares nothing for the shell that is left behind. But from the beginning of time, through this ingrained hope of immortality for the body, man has cared for the body-shell after the spirit has escaped. It is evidenced in the care for the dead body characteristic of all nations. It is evidenced in the names given to graveyards. They are called cemeteries, that is, sleeping places. It is evident in the sculpture on the tomb-stones and in the inscriptions thereon, all tending to show that man desires an answer to the question, "If I die, shall I live again?" And the thought being, not with reference to the continuity of existence in his spiritual nature, but in his body. Hence the resurrection of the dead is made in the Christian system, a pivotal doctrine, as we learn from the Letter to the Corinthians: that our faith is vain, our preaching is vain, we are yet in our sins, our fathers have perished and God's apostles are false witnesses, if the dead rise not. That is the conclusion of the doctrine of salvation in us.

All the rest of chapter 8 is devoted to a new theme, towit:

THE EVERLASTING SECURITY OF THOSE WHO ARE JUSTIFIED BY FAITH

The argument extends from verse 26 to the end of the chapter, and it is perhaps the most remarkable paragraph in inspired literature. It should be memorized by every Christian. Every thought in it has been the theme of consolatory and encouraging preaching.

Let us now consider item by item this argument on the security of the believer:

1. He takes the latitudinal view, from top to bottom. Down here he finds a Christian. Up yonder at the other end of the line is the Advocate. But there is an Advocate here too. And these Advocates, one here on earth in the

depths, and the other yonder in the heights of heaven, are going to see to it that that Christian gets there all right through prayer and faith. If a Christian sins, he must confess it and ask God to forgive him. Sometimes he has not the spirit of prayer and does not feel like asking. But God provides an Advocate, the Holy Spirit, that puts into his heart the spirit of grace and supplication. And the Holy Spirit not only shows him what to pray for, but how to pray. That makes things secure at this end of the line. Up yonder the Advocate in heaven, Jesus Christ the righteous, takes these petitions that the Spirit inspired on earth and goes before the Father, and pointing to the sufficiency of His shed-blood in His death on the cross, secures this salvation from depth to height.

2. The unbroken sweep of the providence of God: "To them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to His purpose."

With Christ on the mediatorial throne in heaven holding in His hand the scepter of universal dominion, constraining everything—beings in heaven above and on the earth beneath and in hell below—to work, not tangentially, but together for good—not evil—to them that love God, in the sweep of this providence all elements and forces of the material world and the spiritual world, are laid under tribute—fire, earth, air, storms and earthquakes, pestilences, good angels and bad, the passions of men, the revolutions in human government—ALL are made, under the directing power of Jesus our King, to conspire to our good. Fortune and misfortune, good report and evil report, sickness or health, life or death, prosperity or adversity, it is all one—the power of God is over them all. Satan is not permitted to put even the weight of a little finger upon the Christian to worry him except in the direction that God will permit, and that will be overruled for his good.

3. This sweep of providential government under our

mediatorial King accords with a linked chain of correlative doctrines reaching from eternity before time to eternity after time. The links of this chain are thus expressed in verses 29, 30: "For whom He foreknew, He also foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first born among many brethren: and whom He foreordained, them he also called; and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom he justified, them He also glorified." Before there was any world, a covenant of grace and mercy was entered into between Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the evidences of which covenant are abundant in the New Testament, and the parts to be performed by each person of the God-head are clearly expressed, viz.: The Father's grace and love in agreeing to send the Son, His covenant obligation to give the Son a seed, His foreknowledge of this seed, His predestination concerning this seed, His justification and adoption of them here in time. Then the Son's covenant was the obligation to assume human nature in His incarnation, voluntarily renouncing the glory that He had with the Father before the world was, and in this incarnation of humility to become obedient unto the death of the cross. The consideration held out before Him, as a hope set before Him, inducing Him to endure the shame of the cross, and the reward bestowed upon Him because of that obedience, was His resurrection, His glorification, His exaltation to the royal priestly throne and His investment with the right of judgment. And then the Spirit's covenant-obligations were to apply this work of redemption in calling, convicting, regenerating, sanctifying and raising from the dead the seed promised to the Son, the whole of it showing that the plan of salvation was not an afterthought; that the roots of it in election and predestination are both in eternity before the world was, and the fruits of it are in eternity after the judgment. The believer is asked to consider this

chain, test each link, shake it and hear it rattle, connected from eternity to eternity.

Every one that God chose in Christ is drawn by the Spirit to Christ. Every one predestinated is called by the Spirit in time, and justified in time, and will be glorified when the Lord comes.

4. It is impossible for finite beings to say anything against the grounds of this security, because "If God is for us, who can be against us?" Because, "He that spared not His own Son, to deliver Him up for us all, how shall He not also with Him freely give us all things?" Then the challenge is sent to the universe to find any one who can lay any charge against God's elect—who in heaven, who among the angels, good or bad, who on the earth? No charge can be brought against a believer because it is God, the Supreme Judge, who has justified him. Justification is the verdict, or declaration, of the supreme court of heaven that in Christ the sinner is acquitted. This decision is rendered once for all, is inexorable and irreversible. It is registered in the Book of Life, and in the great Judgment-Day that book will be the test-book on the throne of that judgment. Whatever may be brought out from all the books that are opened, none of them are decisive and ultimate but one—the Book of Life—and it is not a docket of cases to be tried on that day, but is a register of judicial decisions already rendered; "and it shall come to pass that whosoever is not found already written in that book shall be cast into the lake of fire." Therefore the thrill excited in the heart by that song which our congregations so often used to sing:

"When Thou my righteous Judge shall come,
To take thy ransomed people home
Shall I among them stand?
Shall I, who sometimes am afraid to die
Be found at thy right hand?
O, can I bear the piercing thought,
What if my name should be left out!"

5. The ground of this salvation is what Christ does. Spurgeon calls this 34th verse of the 8th chapter, the four pillars upon which rests the whole superstructure of salvation. They are, (a) The death of Christ. (b) The resurrection of Christ. (c) The exaltation of Christ to the kingly throne. (d) His intercession as our great High Priest. These four doctrines are strictly correlative—they fit into each other. The soul of the Christian does not at the beginning realize the strength of his salvation. Many a one has simply believed on Christ as a Savior without ever anaylzing in his own mind, or separating from each other in thought, the several things done by Christ in order to his salvation. But as he grows in knowledge of these things, he grows in grace and assurance. It was some time after my own soul was saved before I ever understood fully the power of Christ's exaltation, or kingly throne, and still longer before I understood the power of His intercession. I got to the comfort of this last thought one day in reading a passage in Hebrews. "Wherefore also He is able to save to the *uttermost* them that draw near unto God through Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them," Hebrews 7:25. I had never before seen the difference between salvation in justification and salvation to the uttermost. In the same way we may not realize in our joy of regeneration the power of His continuing that good work in us until the day of Jesus Christ, and the great value of the Spirit's work in taking the things of Christ and showing them to us. And as we learn each office of Christ, and just what He does in that office, the greater our sense of security. He is Prophet, Sacrifice, King, Priest, Leader and Judge.

6. The final argument underlying the security of the believer is presented in verses 35-37, that none can separate us from the love of Christ after our union is established with Him. The words here are, "Who shall separate us

from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? In all these things we are more than conquerors." The argument is in full accord with the statement of our Lord, John 10:29: "My Father, who hath given them unto me, is greater than all; and no one is able to snatch them out of the Father's hand." It is further expressed in another passage by the apostle when he says, "I know Him whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that He is able to guard that which I have committed unto Him against that day." And it is further expressed in the seal of the Holy Spirit. We are sealed "unto the day of redemption."

When I was a schoolboy I was wonderfully stirred by an eloquent sermon preached by J. R. Graves in which he pointed out the fact that by faith we commit our lives to Jesus; that life is hid with Christ in God; that life is sealed with the impression of the Holy Spirit until the day of redemption, and then he asked, "Who can pluck that life out of the hands of God?" drawing this vivid picture: "If hell should open her yawning mouth and all of the demons of the pit should issue forth like huge vampires darkening water and land, could they break that seal of God? Could they soar to the heights of heaven? Could they scale its battlements? Could they beat back the angels that guard its walls? Could they penetrate into the presence of the Holy One on His eternal throne, and reach out their demon-claws and pluck our life from the bosom of God where it is hid with Christ in God?"

The pages of religious persecution are very bloody; rack, thumbscrews and fagot have been employed. Confiscation of property, expatriation from country, and hounding pursuit of the exile in foreign lands, exposedness to famine and nakedness and sword and other perils, and yet never has this persecution been able to effect a separation of the believer from his Lord. Roman emperors tried it, Julian

the apostate tried it, Ferdinand and Isabella, Charles V, their son, and Philip II, his son, all tried it in their time. The inquisition held its secret court; war, conflagration and famine wrought their ruin, but the truth prevailed.

All this illustrates the truth that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church. The Genevan, the German, the English State churches have tried, in emulation of the Romanist union of church and State, to crush out the true spirit of Christianity. They have been able to merely scatter the fires, to make them burn over a wider territory as it is expressed concerning the decree to scatter the ashes of Wycliffe in the river.

Now upon these arguments, the two intercessors, the sweep of God's providence, the link-chain reaching from eternity to eternity, the impossibility of any being laying a charge against one whom God has justified, the four pillars, the inability of man or devil to separate from Christ—upon these, the apostle reaches this persuasion:

"For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

QUESTIONS

1. What the final work of salvation in us?
2. What provision did God first make for the immortality of man's body?
3. What defeated that plan, and how is this immortality finally to be accomplished?
4. What Job's testimony to this hope, and what the interpretation of the passage?
5. How is this hope in man evidenced in a singular way?
6. How does Paul elsewhere make the resurrection a pivotal doctrine in the Christian system?
7. Name the six arguments for the security of those who are justified by faith as taught in Romans 8.
8. Explain the argument based on the two intercessors.
9. What the providential argument, and what does it include?

10. What is the link chain argument, and how many and what links in the chain?
11. In the covenant of grace, what the parts to be performed by the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, respectively?
12. What the non-chargeable-elect argument, and what the Book of Life cited in this connection?
13. Recite the stanza from the old song given in this connection.
14. What the ground of this salvation, and what the four-pillar argument?
15. Show how one may not comprehend all this when first converted, and how he may afterwards get great strength from it.
16. What the non-separation argument, what J. R. Graves' illustration of it, and how do the persecutions inflicted upon God's people illustrate a great scripture truth?
17. In view of these arguments, what Paul's persuasion?

XVIII

THE HARMONY OF THE PROBLEM OF JEWISH UNBELIEF WITH THE PLAN OF SALVATION

Scripture: Rom. 9:1—10:21

PAUL'S statement of the plan of salvation closes with chapter 8, so we now take up the problem of Jewish unbelief, its effect on Paul, and the occasion and extent of his concern:

So far as this letter goes we find the discussion in 9:1-5, and in 10:1, 2, but this concern is equally evident in Luke's history of his labors, addresses and sermons in Acts, and in several other letters written by Paul. One of the deepest passions of his soul was excited and stirred by this problem of Jewish unbelief. The grounds of his concern are the following: (1) These people were his kindred according to the flesh. (2) It was his nation and country, and he had an intense patriotism. (3) They were God's adopted people. (4) They had all of the marvelous privileges of that adoption, and these privileges are thus enumerated by him in this 9th chapter, first paragraph: (a) "Whose is the adoption and the glory." This glory was the cloud, symbolizing the Divine Presence. (b) They had the covenants, the covenant of grace with Abraham in Genesis 12, and the covenant of circumcision as expressed in Genesis 17. (c) Then they had the giving of the law on Mt. Sinai —such a law as cannot be paralleled in the later world. The circumstances under which it was given were more imposing and impressive than the giving of any other code in the annals of time. They had that. (d) Then they had

the promises—the promise to Abraham, the promise to Isaac, the promise to Jacob, the promise to the nation, the promise to Moses, and so on. They had all the promises. (e) Then they had the fathers, the patriarchs. It was an illustrious heritage. No other nation had such a list of fathers—Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the twelve patriarchs, the great leaders all through their history. (f) Then they had the services, that is, the imposing ritual of worship set forth in the book of Exodus from chapter 38 to the end, and in all of the book of Leviticus, and a great part of the book of Numbers. That service showed the place to meet God, the time to meet God, the sacrificial means of hearings before God, the mediator through whom they could approach God. They had that service. No other nation has ever had anything like it. All the churches of the present time have not improved that ritual, including the Romans, the Greeks, the Catholics, the Epicureans, and some Baptists who wear robes in the pulpit and intone their services. (g) The last and greatest of the privileges was, that of them came Christ according to the flesh, the line running through Abel, Seth, Heber, Peleg, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David, and on down until we come to Christ himself. They had Christ according to the flesh. That was the ground and the occasion of His interest. So the problem is, that Christ was rejected by His own people. More than once an infidel has said to me, "If the proof and the merits of Christ be so obvious, why is it that His own people did not take Him?"

We now come to the extent of Paul's concern for this rejection of Christ. (1) He says in chapter 10, which is a part of this section, "I bear my people witness that they have a zeal toward God, but not according to knowledge. (2) I sincerely desire the salvation of my people. (3) Their rejection of Christ gives me continual sorrow and pain of heart. (4) Finally, I could wish myself accursed from

Christ for my brethren's sake." There is only one similar expression in the history of men, and that is where Moses, when all Israel had sinned and God said, "I will blot them out," stood in the breach and said, "If thou wilt not forgive these people, blot my name out of thy book." That disposition on the part of Moses and Paul not merely to suffer temporal death but severance from Christ if it would save the nation, approaches the feeling that was in the heart of the Redeemer when He came to die the spiritual death for the salvation of men. Two others had the experience that is here illustrated, for instance, when Abraham offered up his only begotten son, and passed through the anguish of a father's heart in giving up his son. He is the only man in the world whose experience approximated the experience of God the Father, when He gave up His only begotten Son. And Isaac, in consenting to be so sacrificed, approximated the experience of the Son in voluntarily coming at the Father's bidding to die for the world. Higher than all the mountain peaks of time, stands these four names: Abraham, representing the sacrifice of the Father; Isaac, representing the sacrifice of the Son; Moses and Paul, representing the Spirit that prompted Jesus to be forsaken of God in order to the salvation of men.

We come now to the key-sentence of these three chapters, in verse 6: "But it is not as though the Word of God hath come to naught." The object of the plan of salvation as presented in chapter 8 has this objection against it: Since the Jewish people did not believe it, how can we harmonize with that plan the problem of the unbelief of the Jews themselves? He starts off to argue that question by the affirmation that this Jewish rejection of Christ does not militate against the plan of salvation as set forth. That is his proposition, and the first argument that he makes is that all of Abraham's children—all of Abraham's lineal descendants—were never included in that national adoption. Abra-

ham had two sons, Isaac and Ishmael. Ishmael and his descendants, the Ishmaelites, are not included. Keturah, Abraham's second wife, had a pretty large family, and these Midianites, descendants of Keturah, were not included. Then the next one after Abraham, Isaac, had two children, Jacob and Esau. Esau and the Edomites descended from him, through lineal descendants, were not included. He then presents a case of divine sovereignty concerning these two children of Isaac. He says that the selection of the one to be the people of God in the adopted sense and the rejection of the other, was not based upon any work, and good to be done by the one or evil to be done by the other. It was not according to the wish of the parents of those children. The selection was made before the children were born—before either one of them knew good from evil. So that it was not of Isaac that willed Esau to be the heir, nor of Esau that ran to get the venison in order that he might obtain the blessing of the heir, nor of the plotting of Rebecca and Jacob. Their plotting did not have anything to do with it. It was not of him that runneth, nor him that plotteth; it was the act of divine sovereignty. Whatever is meant by this adoption of a nation, it was not based upon any merit in that nation, or in the particular individuals through whom this adoption came. Jerusalem when it was first established was no better than any other city; it was of God's sovereignty just as the raising up of Pharaoh. "For this purpose did I raise thee up, that I might show in thee my power." Right on the heels of that comes the question from the objector, "Why doth He still find fault? For who withstandeth His will?" Paul is not disposed to answer that question in this connection. We will find the answer before we get through with these three chapters, but here he waives it aside with a counter-question: "Hath not the potter power over his clay to take one part of the lump and make a beautiful vessel for the parlor, and to take another part and make a very infe-

rior vessel for the kitchen? And shall either one of the vessels object to the potter?" He waives it for the time being by merely denying the power of the Christian to intrude into the power of the divine sovereignty. His purpose is to show that the Word of God touching salvation has not come to be ineffectual because the Jews rejected it. That is the argument he is on now, and he then advances in it, and says, "Not even all the lineal descendants of Abraham in the select line according to the plan of salvation were to be saved; not all of them could see these two covenants side by side; one was a national covenant, with its seal of circumcision, and promising the earthly Canaan, and the other was the grace covenant that looked to a spiritual seed." Or, as he puts it in another place, "He is not a Jew (in the spiritual sense) who is just one outwardly, but he is a Jew who is one inwardly. The circumcision is not the circumcision of the flesh, but the circumcision of the heart—regeneration." In the exercise of the sovereign purpose of God, there is nothing that the finite man can do concerning Him. It is an ocean too deep for our line to fathom. We would have to be infinite to understand it, but we do know that in all human history, without any explanation to us, God's purpose is working. God had a purpose in having this continent discovered just when it was. He had a purpose in the success of the American Revolution. He had a purpose in the redemption of Texas in the battle of San Jacinto.

High above human thought, beyond the scope of human sight, of the human mind, the Omnipotence and Omniscience is ruling, and His rule is supreme, and yet nobody is taken by the hair and dragged into hell, and nobody is taken by the hair and dragged into heaven, as he will show more particularly later.

Let us explain and give the application of the vessels of wrath and mercy. In chapter 9 is a passage, from verse 22 to the end of the chapter, about the vessels of wrath and

the vessels of mercy. Those that were vessels of wrath, those who voluntarily stand against God, God patiently endured a long time, and His forbearance signified that He was giving them opportunity for repentance. Those vessels of mercy, they also had opportunity for salvation, whether they were Jews or Greeks. He shows that God is no respecter of persons in selecting the Jewish nation. But why did He select that nation? If He had selected the Jewish nation, every one of them to be saved in heaven, and rejected every other nation, then the objection would have been sustained, but it had a different purpose. The election of the Jewish nation looked to the salvation of the Jews and Gentiles that received the message of God, also the covenants, and the coming of Christ from them according to the flesh. That election looked through them to others and, so far as salvation in heaven is concerned, the Jews that believed were saved, and so far as other nations were concerned he quotes certain parts in Hosea and the Old Testament, the paragraph referring to the ingathering of the Gentiles: "I will call them my people which were not my people." In objecting to God's selecting one nation and calling that nation "my people" he says, "I will call them my people which were not my people," and in a place where it is said, "They are not my people, there shall they be called sons of the living God," if they believe on Jesus Christ. He then quotes from Isaiah who distinguishes between the holy stock of Israel and the natural stock of Israel as if he had said, "If the number of Israel had been as abundant as the sands of the sea, it is only the remnant that are saved"—those that by faith accept Christ. We see he is laying the predicate for that olive tree illustration that he will introduce later in the discussion. Isaiah then goes on to say that if the grace of God had not been revealed, and the Lord God of hosts had not left a seed, the whole of them would have been as Sodom and Gomorrah. Nothing but divine grace

saves those that were saved—not their ritual, not their law. He then reaches this conclusion, "What shall we say then?" The Gentiles who followed not after righteousness, that is, the Jewish way, attained to righteousness because they sought it in a different way. The Jew following the law had not arrived at righteousness. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but by works; they stumbled at that stumbling stone.

Next he shows that the rejection of the Jews was not total. He commences chapter 10 by stating that as far as he is personally concerned his heart's desire and prayer for Israel is that they would be saved, and he is willing to acknowledge that they had a zeal, but not the zeal of knowledge. They busied themselves to establish their own plan of righteousness, and he puts it in such a way that we can't mistake the law-righteousness and leave the faith-righteousness as they did. We must not forget that the law says, "Do to live," but faith says "Live to do." In other words, doing the will of God comes out of having been made alive to God. Life must come first; make the tree good, and then the fruit will be good. One of them makes doing the means of life, and the other puts life as a means of doing. Then he shows that while Moses had handed down this law and set before them its requirements that if one would have kept its requirements in strict obedience he would have been saved, but the law required him to start right in his nature and then to continue to do everything that is contained in the law. He goes on to quote from Moses. Paul quotes from the Hebrew and not from the Septuagint which runs thus: "The righteousness which is of faith saith thus, Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend unto heaven (that is, to bring the Savior down, or to bring salvation down) or, Who shall descend from heaven (that is, to bring Christ up from the grave.)" This is the Septuagint idea. The Hebrew idea is not that a man tries to go to

heaven as the ancient Titan tried to do—by piling Pela on Ossa to make a stairway. Nor that he tries to go directly into the depths, down into the abyss, and wrench salvation from the depths. The Hebrew represents him, not as going down, but as going across, saying that man does not go to the other side of the sea to find salvation to bring it back. Paul changes this a little and makes it correspond better than does Moses. Instead of going across the sea, he has the man going down into the depths of the sea, and he goes on, still quoting Moses, that the real salvation does not come from afar. Paul puts this explanation on it, that it was the word that he preached: "It is the word of faith which we preach."

The plan of salvation is not making tedious pilgrimages; it is not wearing a hairy undershirt to irritate; it is not wearing bracelets that have thorns on them, and to keep on doing penance; it is the word of faith.

Thus he says, "You may be sure that if from the heart you believe in Jesus Christ, and if with your lips you make confession of that faith, you shall be saved." It is not an intellectual faith—it is heart-faith. But a good many people misunderstand the import of confession. It doesn't mean to confess sins to your brother, nor to a priest, nor even to God—that is not the confession he is talking about, but it is a public confession of Christ as Savior. If we have not faith enough to confess the Christ that we say we believe in, we have not faith enough to be saved. Confession implies that whoever makes it must have a great deal of courage. In this time of peace it doesn't cost much to confess Christ, and even now sometimes shame prevents confession by young people. The young lady going into a city is told not to join a church because that will deprive her of all social functions. "Whoever shall be ashamed of me before this generation, of him shall I be ashamed before my father and the holy angels. And whosoever shall deny

me, him will I deny." And if we are afraid or ashamed to come out in public, and say, "I take Christ as my Savior," then the Father will be ashamed of us.

This law has no distinction as to nationality; there was only one door to the ark. The elephant went in at the same door as the snail, and the eagle swooped down through the same door that a little wren hopped in at. And there is not a side door for a woman to go in. We all go to Christ through the same door. While it is true that God called Israel out of Egypt, the same Bible says that He called the Philistines out of Caphtor, and He is the Lord of all nations, and the universality of the plan of salvation is expressed in "Whoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Then comes up the question, How can any one call on God who has not believed in God, and how can he believe in a God of whom he has never heard? How can he hear unless somebody tells him—unless there be a preacher—and how can there be a preacher except he be sent? The sending there means God-sent. What a marvelous theme for a missionary sermon!

Having stated that, he raises another question, "Have they not heard? Didn't they have preachers?" Has not the word gone to them? From Genesis we learn that the antediluvians had light enough to be saved, and Paul is here quoting a Psalm: "Their sound went out through all the earth." Jesus Christ is the true light that lights every man that comes into the world. There has been light enough if the people had been willing to walk in the light.

I once heard a Methodist preacher state to a congregation that the heathen that did the best they could would be saved.

But he didn't produce any heathen who had done their best. And where is the man that has done his best?

The plan by which men are to be saved is the plan to make the promise sure to all. It is as quick as lightning

in its application. It is a fine thing for a man to quit his meanness; it is a fine thing for a man to do the best he can, but certainly it is not the way of salvation; we don't secure salvation by that. "With a nation void of understanding will I anger you." In other words, "If you will have no God, you adopted people, I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people," as Isaiah said, "I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them. But to Israel He said, I have stretched out my hands unto this disobedient and gainsaying people." Their whole record is, no matter who called, who was sent, who preached, they rejected. Having shown them that God was not unjust in rejecting them, and that He did not violate the gospel plan of salvation, Paul says, "I am one of them; not all the Jews were lost; I am one of them." Neither in its totality nor in its perpetuity were the Jews rejected. Elijah supposed once that he stood by himself, and that he was the only one left. God says, "I have preserved 7000 that have not bowed the knee to Baal."

Having shown from chapters 9 and 10 that the rejection of the Jews was not total, we will show from chapter 11 that it was not perpetual.

QUESTIONS

1. What the problem of Romans 9:1—11:36?
2. How did it affect Paul?
3. What the grounds of his concern?
4. What the marvelous privileges of the Jews' adoption?
5. What the infidel argument on this point?
6. What the items which indicate the extent of Paul's concern for his people?
7. What Paul's meaning here, and what Old Testament examples of this experience and spirit?
8. What the key-sentence of chapters 9, 10 and 11, and what its meaning?
9. What is Paul's first argument on this point?
10. What the case of divine sovereignty concerning Jacob and Esau?

11. How is this principle illustrated in the selection of Jerusalem?
12. What illustration of this point from the history of Pharaoh?
13. What question from the objector here introduced, and how does Paul dispose of it?
14. What is Paul's purpose in thus disposing of this question?
15. What advance did he then make in his argument, and how does he illustrate it elsewhere?
16. What illustrations of the sovereign purpose of God cited by the author?
17. What the explanation of the vessels of wrath and the vessels of mercy in Rom. 9:22ff?
18. How does Paul show that God was no respecter of persons in selecting the Jewish nation?
19. How does he prove this from the prophets?
20. What the conclusion of all this, then, as stated in the closing part of chapter 9?
21. What the argument of chapter 10?
22. What concession does he make in favor of the Jews in the first part of chapter 10, and what his objection raised?
23. What the difference between the law-righteousness and the faith-righteousness?
24. Why could not any one be saved by the law-righteousness?
25. What the difference in the idea expressed in the Hebrew and that of the Septuagint?
26. What construction does Paul put on it, and what the application?
27. What is the meaning of the confession mentioned in this connection, and what its relation to salvation?
28. How does Paul show here that God makes no distinction between peoples of different nationalities, and what the author's illustration?
29. What the great missionary text in this connection?
30. What Paul's answer to the question, "Have they not heard?" and what the necessity of missionary operations?
31. With what reproof of the Jewish people does Paul close chapter 10?

XIX

THE LIMITATIONS AND MERCIFUL PURPOSE OF GOD'S REJECTION OF ISRAEL

Scripture: Rom. 11:1-36

ISRAEL'S rejection was neither total nor perpetual. The elect, or spiritual Israel, were never cast off. From Abraham to Paul every Israelite who looked through the types and by faith laid hold of the Antitype, was saved. In this sense there were no lost tribes, but out of every tribe the elect, manifested in the circumcision of the heart, not of the flesh, were saved. For example:

1. The apostle cites his own case. That he himself was an Israelite is abundantly shown here, and even more particularly elsewhere, (Phil. 3:4-6; Acts 22:3-15) and yet he was saved after Israel according to the flesh was cast off and the kingdom transferred to the Gentiles, as were all the Jews from Pentecost to Paul. The number of elect Jews thus saved was always greater than appeared to human sight, as evidenced in Elijah's time.

2. Elijah in his panic supposed himself to be alone, but Jehovah showed him that through grace there were seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal.

3. So it continued to be in Paul's time; there was a remnant spared according to grace.

But the apostle is careful to show that this elect-remnant, never cast off, every one of them, was saved by grace, and not one of them by the works of law. Then he explains this finding of salvation by the elect Jews, and the casting off of the non-elect Jews by the two essentially different meth-

ods of seeking salvation. The elect sought it by faith and obtained it; the rest because they persistently sought righteousness by works of the law, rejecting God's righteousness, were judicially blinded as shown: (1) By the law itself, Deut. 29:4; (2) by the prophets, Isa. 29:10; (3) by the Psalms, Psa. 69:22.

Having shown the casting off was never total, and why, he then shows that it was not intended to be perpetual by proving the ultimate restoration of all Israel as a nation, whenever it should turn to the grace-method of salvation, the scriptural proof of which is as follows:

1. In the law itself, which denounces their casting off, is the promise of an expiation through grace, Deut. 32:43.

2. In the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the temple it is suggested, I Kings 8:46-53.

3. In the prophets it is clearly foretold, and all the method of it, Isa. 66:8; Ezek. 36:22—37:28; Zech. 12:9—13:1.

The element of mercy dominant in the election of Israel as a nation is that they were chosen that through them all the nations might be blessed. The element of mercy in their rejection is that through their downfall life might come to other nations. The element of mercy toward the Jews in the call of the Gentiles was that cast-off Israel might be provoked to return to God. In saving Gentiles there was an aim at the salvation of his cast-off people. This is proved in his argument thus: "By their fall salvation is come to the Gentiles to provoke them to jealousy," and then he magnified his own office as an apostle to the Gentiles to provoke the jealousy of his own people in order that he might save some. He foresees a wonderful effect on the Gentiles in the restoration of the Jews. It will be even more beneficial than their downfall: "Now if their fall is the riches of the world, and their loss the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness? * * * For if the

casting away of them is the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" 11:12, 15. Then our concern, prayer and labor for that great future event—the restoration of God's ancient people—is a concern for other nations who never will be thoroughly aroused until moved by redeemed Israel.

A passage from Peter shows the relation of the conversion of the Jews to our Lord's final advent, and a declaration of our Lord shows the time of this general salvation of the Jews. Peter says, "Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; and that He may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus: whom the heavens must receive until the times of restoration of all things, whereof God spoke by the mouth of His holy prophets that have been from of old," Acts 3:19-21. Our Lord says, "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led captive unto all the nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fullfilled," Luke 21:24. Then according to Isaiah, Ezekiel and Zechariah, the means and methods of this great salvation of the Jews are as follows:

1. It will be preceded by a gathering together of Israel out of all nations.

2. Christ whom they pierced will be lifted up in Gentile preaching.

3. The Holy Spirit in convicting and converting power will be poured out on them, whereby they shall mourn and pray and see the Lord as their Savior.

4. The nation shall be born of God in a day.

The apostle bases this marvelous work of God upon the principle that "if the first fruit is holy, so is the lump: and if the root is holy, so are the branches. * * * And this is my covenant unto them, When I shall take away their sins

* * * For the gifts and the calling of God are not repented of," 11:16, 27, 29. Then follows his illustration of the olive tree, the explanation of which is as follows:

1. Christ is the root.
2. The holy stock is the spiritual elect, Israel.
3. The branches broken off are the unbelieving Jews.
4. The branches grafted in are the believing Gentiles.
5. The principle is vital and spiritual connection with Christ, through faith, without respect to Jew or Gentile.
6. The unbelieving children of Abraham are like branches merely tied on the stock externally; there is no communication of the fatness of the sap into the veins of the branches tied on externally.
7. So a Gentile tied on externally, without this vital connection, will be broken off.

The divine purpose in shutting up both Gentile and Jew unto disobedience as shown in the argument, 3:9-20, is expressed thus: "For God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that He might have mercy upon all," 11:32. We will conclude this discussion with an analysis of the doxology which is the climax of his argument:

1. An exclamation of the profundity of the riches of both God's wisdom and knowledge.
2. The incomprehensibility to the finite mind of His judgments and ways.
3. No finite being knew His mind or advised His actions.
4. No beneficiary of His goodness ever first gave to God as a meritorious ground of the benefaction.
5. Because He is the source of all good, and the medium of salvation from its initiation to its consummation, all the glory belongs to God.

QUESTIONS

1. What the limits of Israel's rejection?
2. Wherein was it not total? Illustrate.
3. What is the apostle careful to show about this elect remnant, never cast off?
4. How does he explain this finding of salvation by the elect Jews, and the casting off of the non-elect Jews?
5. How is the judicial blindness of the non-elect Jews shown?
6. How does he next show that the casting off was not intended to be perpetual?
7. What the scriptural proof of this ultimate restoration of Israel?
8. What element of mercy was dominant in the election of Israel as a nation?
9. What element of mercy in their rejection?
10. What element of mercy toward Jews in the call of the Gentiles?
11. How is this proved in his argument?
12. What effect on the Gentiles does Paul foresee in the restoration of the Jews?
13. What then our concern, prayer and labor for that great future event, the restoration of God's ancient people?
14. Quote a passage from Peter showing the relation of the conversion of the Jews to our Lord's final advent.
15. Quote a passage from our Lord showing the time of this general salvation of the Jews.
16. According to Isaiah, Ezekiel and Zechariah, what the means and methods of this great salvation of the Jews?
17. Upon what principle does the apostle base this marvelous work of God?
18. In the olive-tree illustration what the root, the holy stock, the branches broken off, the branches grafted in, the principle, the condition of the unbelieving children of Abraham, and what of the Gentile tied on externally?
19. What then the divine purpose in shutting up both Gentile and Jew unto disobedience?
20. Give an analysis of the doxology.

XX

THE DOCTRINE OF SALVATION BY GRACE APPLIED TO PRACTICAL LIFE

Scripture: Rom. 12:1—16:27

THE prevalent characteristic of all Paul's teachings concerning the gospel is the unfailing observance of the order and relation of doctrine and morals. He never "puts the cart before the horse," and never drives the horse without the cart attached and following after. He was neither able to conceive of morals not based on antecedent doctrine, nor to conceive of doctrine not fruiting in holy living. He rigidly adhered to the Christ-idea, "First make the tree good, and then the fruit will be good." His clear mind never confounded cause and effect. To his logical and philosophical mind it was a reversal of all natural and spiritual law to expect good trees as a result of good fruit, but rather good fruit evidencing a good tree. So he conceived of justification through faith, and regeneration through the Spirit as obligating to holy living. If he fired up his doctrinal engine it was not to exhaust its steam in whistling, but in sawing logs, or grinding grist, or drawing trains.

The modern cry, "Give us morals and away with dogma," would have been to him a philosophical absurdity, just as the antinomian cry, "faith makes void the law—let us sin the more that grace may abound," was abhorrent and blasphemous to him.

A justification of a sinner through grace that delivered

from the guilt of sin was unthinkable to him if unaccompanied by a regeneration that delivered from the love of sin, and a sanctification that delivered from the dominion of sin.

He expected no good works from the dead, but insisted that those made alive were created unto good works. His philosophy of salvation, in the order and relation of doctrine and morals, is expressed thus in his letter to Titus: "For the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men, instructing us to the intent that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope and appearing of the glory of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for His own possession, zealous of good works." "But when the kindness of God our Savior, and His love toward man appeared, not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to His mercy He saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which He poured out upon us richly, through Jesus Christ our Savior; that, being justified by His grace, we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life. Faithful is the saying, and concerning these things I desire that thou affirm confidently, to the end that they who have believed God may be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men," Titus 2:11-15; 3:4-8.

So in every letter there is first the doctrinal foundation, and then the application to morals. But as in this letter we have the most complete and systematic statement of the doctrines of grace as a foundation (chapters 10-11) so in this, the following section (chapters 12-15), we have the most elaborate superstructure of morals.

The analysis and order of thought in this great section are—

1. Salvation by grace through faith obligates the observance of all duties toward God the Father on account of what He does for us in the gift of His Son, in election, predestination, justification and adoption, 12:1.

2. It obligates the observance of all duties toward God the Holy Spirit for what He does in us in regeneration and sanctification, 12:2.

3. It obligates the observance of all duties toward the church, with its diversity of gifts in unity of body, 12:3-13.

4. It obligates the observance of all duties toward the individual neighbor in the outside world, 12:14-21.

5. It obligates the observance of all duties to the neighbors, organized as society or state, 13:1-13.

6. It obligates the observance of all duties arising from the Christian's individual relation to Christ the Savior, 13:14; 14:7-12.

7. It obligates the observance of all duties toward the individual brother in Christ, 14:1—15:7.

8. The last obligation holds regardless of the race distinctions, Jew and Gentile, 15:8-24, and includes the welcome of the apostle to the Gentiles, prayer for the welcome and success of his service toward the Jewish Christians in their need, 15:25-29, and prayer for his deliverance from unbelieving Jews, 15:30-33.

As to the sum of these obligations—

1. They cover the whole scope of morals, whether in the decalogue, as given to the Jews, or the enlarged Christian code arising from grace.

2. They conform to relative proportions, making first and paramount morals toward God, whether Father, Son, or Holy Spirit, not counting that morals at all which leaves out God in either His unity of nature, or trinity of persons, and making that second, subordinate and correlative which is morals toward men.

The duty toward God the Father, in view of what He has

done for us in grace and mercy, is to present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, and acceptable to God, 12:1, and respect His prerogative, 12:19, which is illustrated by Paul elsewhere. He says, "I die daily," meaning that though alive His members were on the rack of death all the time. He says, "I mortify my members," and, "I keep my body under," *i.e.,* he kept his redeemed soul on top, dominating his body. He made his body as "Prometheus bound" on the cold rock of Caucasus, vultures devouring his vitals every day as they were renewed every night, a living death.

Our duty toward God, the Holy Spirit, in view of what He graciously does in us is found in 12:2: Negatively—Let not the regenerate soul be conformed with the spirit and course of this evil world, whether in the lust of the eye or pride of life. *Positively*—Be transformed in continual sanctification in the renewing of the mind. That is, working out the salvation which the Spirit works in us, as He, having commenced a good work in us (regeneration) continues it (through sanctification) until the day of Jesus Christ. Or, as this apostle says elsewhere, Christ, having been formed in us the hope of glory, we are changed into that image from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord.

The duties toward the church are found in 12:3-13:

1. Not to think more highly of one's self in view of the other members of the church. Here are a lot of people in one church; now let not one member put himself too high in view of the other members of that church.

2. To think only according to the proportion of faith given to him for the performance of some duty. If I am going to put an estimate upon myself in the relation to my church members, a standard or estimate should be, What is the proportion of faith given to me? Say A has so much, C has so much, D has so much, and E has least of all; then E ought not to think himself the biggest of all. The

standard of judgment is the proportion of faith given to each member.

3. He must respect the unity of the church as a body. In that illustration used the church is compared to a body having many members. The hand must not say, "I am everything," and the eye of the body must not say, "I am everything," nor the ear, "I am everything," nor the foot, "I am everything." In estimating we have to estimate the function of each part, the proportion of power given to that part, and it is always not as a sole thing, but in its relation to every other part—that is a duty that a church member must perform. Sometimes a man easily forgets that he is just one of many in the organism.

4. He must respect its diversity of gifts. That is one part of it that I comply with. If there is anything that rejoices my heart, it is the diversity of gifts that God puts in the church. I never saw a Christian in my life that could not do some things better than anybody else in the world. I would feel meaner than a dog if I didn't rejoice in the special gifts of any other member in the church. What a pity it would be if we had just one kind of a mold, and everybody was run through like tallow so as to make every candle alike. The duty of the church is to respect the unity of the body, and its diversity of gifts.

5. Each gift is to be exercised with its appropriate corresponding limitation. The duties to the individual neighbor of the outside world, even though hostile to us, are found in 12:14-21:

1. To bless him when he persecutes.

2. To be sympathetic toward him, rejoicing in his joy, and weeping in his sorrow.

3. Several Christians should not be of different mind toward him. The expression in the text is to be like-minded. What is the point of that? We are dealing now with individuals outside. Here is A, a Christian, B, a Christian, C,

a Christian, and the outsider is watching. A makes one impression on his mind, B makes a different one, and C makes still a different one. The influence from these several Christians does not harmonize; it is not like-minded; but if he says that A, B, C, all in different measures perhaps, be every one of the same mind, then he sees that there is a unifying power in Christians. How often do we hear it said, "If every Christian were like you, I would want to be one, but look yonder at that deacon, or at that sister." We should be like-minded to those outside so that every Christian that comes in may make a similar impression for Christ's sake.

4. We should not, in dealing with him, respect big outsiders only, but condescend to the lowly—to men of low estate. Some of them are very rich, some of them are influential socially, some of them are what we call poor, country folk. We should not be highminded in our dealings with these sinners, but condescend to men of low estate. Let them feel that we are willing to go and help them.

5. We should not let our wisdom toward him be self-conceit, *i. e.*, let it not seem to him that way.

6. When he does evil to us, we should not repay in kind.

7. We should let him see that we are honest men. Ah me, how many outsiders are repelled because all Christians do not provide things honest in the sight of the outside world!

8. So far as it lieth in us we should be peaceable with him. That means that is is absolutely impossible to be peaceable with a man that has no peace in him. He wants to fuss anyhow, and goes around with a chip on his shoulder. He goes around snarling and showing his teeth. There are some people that are not peaceable, but so far as our life is concerned, we should be peaceable with them.

9. We should not avenge on him wrongs done us by him.

Vengeance belongs to God; we should give place to God's wrath.

10. We should feed him if hungry, and give him drink if thirsty.

11. We should not allow ourselves to be overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good. We should not get off when we come in contact with evil people, but just hang on and overcome evil with good.

The duties to the state are as follows:

1. Be subject to higher powers, and do not resist them, for (a) God ordained them. (b) Makes them a terror to evil works. (c) God's minister for good. (d) And for conscience sake we must respect the state.

2. Pay our taxes.

3. Whatever is due to each office: "Render honor to whom honor is due."

4. Keep out of debt: "Owe no man anything but good will."

5. Keep the moral code: "Do not steal; do not commit adultery; do not covet anything that is thy neighbor's, and thus love thy neighbor."

6. Avoid the world's excesses, revelings, and such like.

The duties toward God the Son, in view of what He has done for us and in view of our vital union with Him, are set forth in 14:7-12:

1. Negatively: Live not unto self.

2. Positively: Live unto Jesus, respecting His prerogatives and servants.

Let us now look at the duties to individual Christians. We have considered the Christians as a body. What are the duties to individual Christians? Romans 14:1—15:7 contains the duty to individual Christians. Let us enumerate these duties somewhat:

1. Receive the weak in faith. We have a duty to every weak brother; receive him, but not to doubtful disputations.

If we must have our abstract, metaphysical, hair-splitting distinctions, let us not spring them on the poor Christian that is just alive.

2. We should not judge him censoriously, instituting a comparison between us and him; we should not say to him, "Just look at me."

3. We should not hurt him by doing things, though lawful to us, that will cause him to stumble. The explanation there is in reference to a heathen custom. The heathen offered sacrifices to their gods, and after the sacrifice they would hang up the parts not consumed and sell as any other butchered meat. Could we stand up like Paul and say, "It won't hurt me to eat that meat, but there is a poor fellow just born into the kingdom, and he is weak in the faith. He sees me eating this meat that has been offered in sacrifice to idols, and he stumbles, therefore I will not eat meat?" He draws the conclusion that if a big fellow can do that he can too, and he goes and worships the idols. The strong through the exercise of his liberty that he could have done without, caused his fall into idolatry. That is what he meant when he wrote, "Do not hurt him; do not cause him to stumble." He gives two reasons why we must not cause him to stumble on account of a little meat. He says, (a) "Because the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit. (b) If we consider this weak brother, our consideration will be acceptable to Christ, and approved of men, but if we trample on the poor fellow that is weak in the faith, Christ won't approve of it, and men won't approve of it."

4. Follow the things that make for peace. It is individual Christians that we are talking about, and we come in contact with them where we have A, B, C, D, and E, and the first thing we know a little root of bitterness springs up among them and stirs up a disagreement. The point is that we should follow the things that make for peace, just

as far as we can, and sometimes that will take us a good ways. He gives this illustration where he says, "If my eating meat offered to idols causes my brother to stumble, then I am willing to take a total abstinence pledge." Then he extends it: "Nor drink wine, nor do anything whereby my brother is caused to stumble." There is meat other than that which is offered to idols.

5. Bear his infirmities. One man said, "There is much of human nature in the mule, but more of the mule in human nature." The best man I ever knew had some infirmities, and I can see some of mine with my eyes shut, and I believe better with them shut than with them open. We all have infirmities in some direction or another.

6. We should seek to please him rather than to please ourselves. We are not to sacrifice a principle, but if we can please him without sacrificing a principle, rather than please ourselves, why not do it? Let us make him feel good if we can. This is the duty to the individual Christian.

The duties of Christian Jews to Gentile neighbors are found in 15:8-24. There they are all elaborated. Even in the Jew's Bible, all through its parts, it is shown that God intended to save the Gentiles. The duty of Gentile Christians to the Jews is found in 15-27, showing that there is a debt and that it ought to be paid.

QUESTIONS

1. What the prevalent characteristics of all Paul's teachings concerning the gospel? Illustrate.
2. What Paul's attitude toward the modern cry, "Give us morals and away with dogma," and how does he express his conviction on this subject elsewhere?
3. How is this thought especially emphasized in this letter?
4. What the analysis and order of thought in this letter in chapters 12-15?
5. What may we say as to the sum of these obligations?
6. What the duty toward God the Father, in view of what He has done for us in grace and mercy?

7. What the meaning of "living sacrifice?" Illustrate.
8. What our duty toward God the Holy Spirit, in view of what He graciously does in us?
9. What our duties toward the church?
10. What our duties to the individual neighbor of the outside world, even though hostile to us?
11. What our duties to the state?
12. What our duties toward God the Son, in view of what He has done for us and in view of our vital union with Him?
13. What the duties to individual Christians?
14. What the duties of Christian Jews to Gentile neighbors?

XXI

SOME FRAGMENTS OF CHAPTERS 14-16

Scriptures: All references

THESE scriptures have been covered generally in the discussion already. So in this chapter it is our purpose only to gather up the fragments that nothing may be lost. Then let us commence by expounding 14:9:

1. The revised version here is better than the common version.

2. The death of Christ was on the cross; the living after death is His resurrection—life in glory. (Compare Rev. 1:18.)

3. The end of Christ's dying and reviving is said to be that He might be Lord of both the dead and the living, the dead meaning those sleeping in the grave to be raised from the grave at His coming.

The latter clause of 14:14 does not make our thought of what is sin the standard of sin, but God's law alone determines that. It means that when a man violates his own conception of law he is in spirit a sinner, seeing that he goes contrary to his standard.

The doctrine of 14:20,21 is that what is not sin *per se* may become sin under certain conditions arising from our relations to others. For example:

1. Eating meat offered to idols is lawful *per se,* Rom. 14:14; I Cor. 8:4.

2. But if it cause a weak brother to worship idols, then charity may justify a total abstinence pledge, 14:21; I Cor. 8:13.

3. This thing lawful *per se,* but hurtful in its associations and effects on the weak, may be also the object of church-prohibition, the Holy Spirit concurring, Acts 15:29.

4. And a church refusing to enforce the prohibition becomes the object of Christ's censure and may forfeit its office or lamp-stand, Rev. 2:14-16.

In this whole chapter (14), particularly in the paragraph, verses 22, 23, (1) what is the meaning of the word, "faith," (2) does the closing paragraph make all accountability dependent on subjective moral conviction, and (3) does it teach that the actions of unbelievers are sins?

1. Faith, in this chapter throughout, does not so much refer to the personal acceptance of Christ as to the liberty in practice to which that acceptance entitles. So that, "weak in faith," verse one, does not imply that some strongly accept Christ and others lightly. But the matter under discussion is, What liberty in practice does faith allow with reference to certain specified things, the lawfulness or expediency of which may be a matter of scruple in the sensitive but uninformed conscience of some? One may have faith in Christ to receive Him though in his ignorance he may not go as far as another in the conception of the liberty to which this faith entitles him as to what foods are clean or unclean, what days are holy or common and as to partaking in feasts of meats which have been offered to idols.

2. The "whatsoever" of verse 23 is neither absolute nor universal in its application. It is limited first to the specified things or their kind, and second, to believers, having no reference to outsiders making no profession of faith.

3. Subjective moral conviction is not a fixed and ultimate standard of right and wrong, which would be a mere sliding scale, but it is God's law; yet this chapter, and particularly its closing paragraph, seems to indicate that the willful violation of conscience contains within itself a seed of destruction as has been intimated in chapter 2:14-16.

4. If this whole chapter was not an elaboration of the duties of a Christian toward his fellow-Christian, both presumed to be members of one body, the particular church, it might plausibly be made to appear that "faith" in this chapter means belief of what is right and wrong.

The theme of chapter 16 is The Courteous Recognition of the Christian Merits and Labors of all Workers for Christ, Each in His Own or Her Own Sphere. The great lessons of this chapter are—

1. As we have in this letter the most complete and systematic statement of Christian doctrine, and the most systematic and elaborate application of morals based on the doctrine, so appropriately its conclusion is the most elaborate and the most courteous recognition of the Christian merits and labors of all classes of kingdom workers in their respective spheres.

2. With the Letter to Philemon it is the highest known expression of delicate and exquisite courtesy.

3. It is a revelation of the variety and value of woman's work in the apostolic churches, and in all her fitting spheres of activity.

4. It is a revelation of the value of great and consecrated laymen in the work of the kingdom.

5. It is a revelation of the fellowship of apostolic Christians and their self-sacrificing devotion to each other.

6. It magnifies the graces of hospitality.

7. It magnifies the power of family-religion whether of husband and wife, brother and sister, more distant kindred, or master and servant.

8. It digs up by the roots a much later contention and heresy of one big metropolitan church in a city, with a dominant bishop, exercising authority over smaller churches and "inferior clergy" in that it clearly shows that there was not in central Rome one big church, with a nascent pope, lording it over suburban and village churches. There was

no hero, no "church of Rome," but several distinct churches in Rome whose individuality and equality are distinctly recognized.

9. It shows the fellowship of churches, however remote from each other, and their comity and co-operation in kingdom work.

10. It shows in a remarkable way how imperial Rome with its world-wide authority, its military roads and ship-lines, its traffic to and fro from center to each point of the circumference of world-territory and its amalgamation of nations, was a providential preparation for the propagation of a universal religion.

11. The case of Phoebe (16:1) in connection with hints here and elsewhere, particularly I Tim. 3:11, sandwiched between verses 10 and 12, seems to prove the office of deaconess in the apostolic churches, of the propriety and apparent necessity of which there can be no question.

12. The various names of those saluted and saluting, about 35 in all, indicating various nationalities, not only show that the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles is broken down in the churches, but that in the kingdom "there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman, but Christ is all and in all."

13. But the lesson seems greatest in its mercy and privileges conferred on women and slaves.

14. The homiletic value, in pulpit themes suggested, from these various names, labors and conditions, which Spurgeon seems to have recognized most of all preachers.

Let us now expound the entreaty in verses 17, 18, containing the following points:

1. We need to distinguish between those "causing the divisions" and "those causing occasions of stumbling." The "divisions" would most likely come from a bigoted and narrow Jew insisting on following Moses in order to become

a Christian, as in the churches of Galatia, Corinth and elsewhere, but those "causing occasions of stumbling" (as in 14:14-22) would likely be Gentiles insisting on the extreme of liberty in the eating of meats offered to idols, and like things.

2. While both classes are in the church, and not outsiders, as many teach, yet neither class possesses the spiritual-mindedness and charity of a true Christian, but under the cloak of religion they serve their own passions for bigotry in one direction or license in another direction, utterly misapprehending the spiritual character of the kingdom of God.

3. Both classes are to be avoided as enemies of the cross of Christ. Compare Phil. 3:18; Gal. 5:19-23.

In verse 20 there are three points:

1. There is an allusion to the promise in Gen. 3:11 that the Seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head.

2. This was fulfilled by Christ's triumph on the cross over Satan, Col. 2:15.

3. And will be fulfilled in all Christ's seed at the final advent.

QUESTIONS

1. What three things noted on Rom. 14:9?
2. Does the latter clause of 14:14 make our thought of what is sin the standard of sin? If not, what does it mean?
3. What the doctrine of 14:20, 21? Give examples.
4. In the whole of chapter 14, particularly in the paragraph, verses 22, 23, (1) What is the meaning of the word, "faith?" (2) Does the closing paragraph make all accountability dependent on subjective moral conviction? (3) Does it teach that the actions of unbelievers are sins?
5. What the great lessons of chapter 16?
6. What preacher seems to have most recognized the homiletic value of this chapter?
7. Expound the entreaty in 16:17, 18.
8. What the three points of 16:20?

THE BOOK OF PHILIPPIANS

XXII

INTRODUCTION

Scriptures: All references

WE come now to the third group of Paul's letters, *i. e.*, the letters of his first imprisonment at Rome. These letters, in chronological order, are Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians, and Hebrews.

It would be well at this point to name several books, most of which have already been given, as general helps on the whole group: Conybeare & Howson's "Life and Epistles of Paul," Farrar's "Life and Letters of Paul," Stalker's "Life of Paul," "Horæ Paulinæ," by Wm. Paley, Robertson's "Syllabus of N. T. Study," "St. Paul," by Adolphe Monod, "Meyer's Translation," "Divine Authority of Paul's Writings," by Malcolm McGregor, The author's Sermon before the Southern Baptist Convention at Hot Springs, Ark., 1908, on "The Nature, Person and Offices of our Lord and His Relations to the Father, the Universe and the Church," Wilkinson's "Epic of Saul" and "Epic of Paul."

The special helps on this book are as follows:

For Exposition—"Lightfoot on Philippians" (the best for exposition and criticism,) "American Commentary," "Pidge on Philippians," Cambridge Bible, "Moule on Philippians," Expositors' Bible, "Rainey on Philippians," Speakers' or "Bible Commentary," "Jamieson, Fausset & Brown," brief and critical.

For Homiletics as well as Exposition—"The Pulpit Commentary" on Philippians, Robert Hall's "Expository Sermons on Philippians," Johnston's "Expository Lectures."

For Devotion—Hoyt's "Gleams from the Prison of Paul."

For Geographical and Historical Setting—Both Conybeare & Howson and Farrar cited in the general helps for the group of letters, to which we may add Ramsay on "Paul the Traveler," and Forbes on the "Footsteps of Paul."

Expository, Practical and Devotional—Matthew Henry, or better, "The Comprehensive Commentary," edited by Jenkins.

REMARKS

1. The time order of Philippians given above has been questioned, on plausible grounds, by able scholars, but the author believes that the stronger arguments support the order given.

2. The assignment of the authorship of Hebrews to Paul and its collocation above have both been confidently challenged by able modern scholars, whose arguments will receive most respectful consideration in the introductory chapters to that book. The author will claim for his own views on both points no more value than the weight of his reasons warrants.

The Importance of this group of letters has never been questioned. In them is a distinct advance—

1. In the amplification of the plan of salvation.

2. In clearness and volume of doctrine concerning the nature, person, and offices of our Lord, in order to meet new heresies developed in the churches.

3. In the idea, purpose and mission of the church.

4. In the relations of the Old Covenant to the New Covenant, and the supersession of the Old by the New.

These very great advances in New Testament teaching invest these letters with a value for all people of all time.

Their importance appears also from the relations of the group to other New Testament books before and after:

1. We find in Philippians 3 the connecting link with the controversies of the preceding group of letters, and in 2:5-11 an introduction to Colossians and Ephesians.

2. We find not only additions to the history of Paul which was abruptly closed in Acts, and light on the prison life in Rome, but we see that the word of God cannot be bound, nor the outgoings of a great Christian heart imprisoned.

3. We will be prepared to understand better all the succeeding letters of Paul, with their hints of additional history.

4. We find that other New Testament authors, far remote from each other, are constrained to write to the same people addressed by this group of letters, mainly on the same lines of thought, and with a view to correcting the same dangerous heresies. To one province of Asia Minor the eyes of Paul in Rome, Peter in Babylon, John in Ephesus or an exile in Patmos, Jude in Jerusalem, are all turned in deepest concern.

To become systematic theologians on the plan of salvation; to have full conceptions of the nature, person, offices and relations of our Lord; to have a rounded conception of the idea, purpose and mission of the church; to know the relations between the covenants, the abrogation of the one in order to its supersession by the other, every way superior, we must master this group of letters. We should lay hold on all available help and give honest, hard, painstaking and prayerful study to the letters. There is no room here for the idler. Mental and heart laziness should have no place here.

We should not only acquire the needful knowledge, paying whatever necessary cost, but assimilate it in our lives that in wisdom we may apply it to life's emergencies. It is not

sufficient that we be good ministers, but able ministers also, of our Lord. While it is the business of our Seminaries to give edge to the ax and point to the sword, it is the student's business to turn the grindstone. Nor will mere equipment serve the purpose. We must learn how to use the sharpened tools to the best advantage. Not what we eat, but what we digest becomes a part of ourselves.

As we take up each letter of the group these questions at least must be answered: Who wrote it? When? From what place and under what conditions? To whom addressed, and their condition? What the occasion? What the purpose? What the matter? What the character and style? What its relation to other books? What its place in the canon? What its contribution to the sum total of Bible truth? What its great pulpit themes? What its influence on later times? Moreover, the geographical and historical setting should be as familiar as our front yard.

Let us now consider the first book of the group. The author of this letter, beyond all reasonable question, is Paul. The letter avows it; the character, style, circumstances and context demonstrate it; abundant historical evidence establishes it. When, whence and under what circumstances the letter was written go together in this case. The date determines the place, and *vice versa,* and the two determine the circumstances. Some, without due warrant, have contended for Cæsarea as the place, which would affect both date and circumstances. The contention rests on such insufficient grounds that it is not worth our while to waste time on it. The place was Rome. The circumstances are those of the author's first imprisonment in the imperial city, as briefly set forth by Luke in Acts 28:14-31, and supplemented by allusions in all the letters of the group. See particularly Philippians 1:12-25; 2:17; 4:10-18; Philemon verses 1, 10, 22, 23; Col. 4:3, 18; Eph. 3:1; Heb. 13:3, 18, 19, 23, 24. The circumstances, in the main, were these:

1. Though a prisoner he was not closely confined, but allowed to live in his own hired house, using it as a preaching house, and for the reception of his many visitors as well as a center of wide correspondence.

2. The restraint on his movements consisted in his being chained to a soldier of the Prætorian guard, changed from time to time.

3. The chaining to so many of these soldiers in succession enabled him to leaven the whole division of the emperor's guard with the gospel.

4. The fact of the restraint on his personal movements stirred up his friends to preach the gospel more earnestly and effectually, and also gave opportunity to his Jewish enemies in the Roman churches to greater activity in preaching.

5. The imprisonment, in checking his travels and limiting his personal preaching, necessitated a resort to writing, which, as embodied in these letters, bequeathed a legacy to all succeeding ages incomparably richer than could have been derived from all his *viva voce* sermons, so his bonds tended to the furtherance of the gospel. The Word of God was not bound. Through these letters and through the labors of his friends—Luke, Timothy, Tychicus, Epaphroditus, Epaphras, and many others—he reached the heart of the world and superintended the work of two continents.

6. The beastly and bloody Nero was the reigning Cæsar, but not yet were his hate and fury turned against the Christians. Paul had not yet been brought to trial—so long the law's delay—but felt confident of acquittal, and was assured in heart that he would again resume his missionary activities. This hope of release finds expression in all the letters of this group. He held himself ready, however, for life or death.

7. His support, in the meantime, was a serious question, as we have no passage to show that he was permitted to

work at his trade. Philippi, at least, sent contributions to him, but we have no knowledge that any other church did, and in his expression of thanks for this help, he lets us know how extreme was his want at times, Phil. 4:11-13.

The exact date of the letter is not so clear, nor the order of place in the group. It is evident that the letter was not written in the beginning of his two years' imprisonment at Rome, but this is equally evident concerning the other letters of the group. All of them belong to the second year, so that there was time enough for all necessarily antecedent events in the case of any of them. Within a year two or more trips either way could easily have been made from Rome to Philippi, Colossæ and Ephesus, and back again to Rome.

The letters to Philemon, the Colossians and the Ephesians were all sent at one time. The internal evidence is strong that Philippians preceded them, and that Hebrews was the latest of all.

The third chapter of Philippians (with 1:15) is a distinct echo of the great controversies in the letters of the preceding group, particularly Galatians and Romans, and is both the connecting link and surviving wave of that controversy. The issue in Hebrews is quite distinct, and relates to an utter break between Christianity and Judaism—a later development. Colossians and Ephesians contend against a heresy unknown to Romans and Galatians.

Thus, while Philippians connects back with the preceding group, it is equally evident that chapter 2:6-11 on the nature, person and office-work of our Lord is a fitting introduction to the enlarged discussion on the same point in Colossians and Ephesians. The time order of the group given in the beginning of this chapter is most philosophical and is better sustained by the evidence. The date, therefore, is A.D. 62.

The occasion of the letter is clear from the context, 2:25-30; 4:10-18:

1. The church at Philippi, having learned of Paul's arrival at Rome, his imprisonment there and consequent privation, generously (and for the fourth time since he established the church) made up a contribution in his behalf, sending it by Epaphroditus, one of their elders.

2. Epaphroditus, stirred in heart by what he learned at Rome, entered the work there so vigorously that he brought on an almost fatal sickness.

3. The concern of his home church for him in this illness, of which they had heard, filled him with longing to return to them.

4. So when able to travel he is sent to bear this letter.

To whom addressed? The first verse tells us: "To all the saints in Christ Jesus that are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." The history of the establishment of this church is found in Acts 16, and is elaborately considered in the interpretation of that book. Its subsequent history up to the writing of this letter may be gathered from allusions in Acts 20:1-6, in the letters of the preceding group, and in this letter. Something of this important history needs restatement here, as it is not merely thrilling in interest and teeming with profitable lessons, but because it is necessary to the proper interpretation of the letter itself:

1. Philippi was the first church established by Paul in Europe. Only the churches in Rome, established by others, preceded it in Europe.

2. The marks of a special providence leading to its establishment are exceptionally clear and convincing. It was not in Paul's mind to pass over into Europe at this time, but quite otherwise. His mind turned to pro-consular Asia, but the Holy Spirit forbade him at this time (Acts 16:6), opening later, when matters were riper, a great and effectual door in that province (Acts 19, and I Cor. 16:8,9).

Barred from Asia, he attempted to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit of Jesus suffered him not (Acts 16:7), and so he was led to Troas on the Ægæan Sea, which separated Asia from Europe, and there, at his wits' end, a vision directed him to Macedonia. The lessons of this providential guidance are valuable for all time, towit:

(a) Jesus selects the preacher's field of labor, as well as the preacher himself.

(b) It is not His method to require the conversion of everybody in one field, whether country or city, before carrying the gospel elsewhere, but to establish here and there centers of radiating light.

(c) The Holy Spirit is the guide of both preacher and church, and His mind may be assuredly gathered from inward monition, outward circumstances and Providence.

Philippi was a Roman Colony, with Roman citizenship, Roman law and magistrates, to which facts there is abundant incidental allusion in both the history and the letter. At no other place of his labors, so far, were there relatively so few Jews—not even one synagogue. There was only a prayer chapel, and here first does he meet pure Gentile persecution. All persecutions of both our Lord and His church, so far, were either altogether Jewish or instigated by Jews, and so will it be for years to follow, Ephesus being a later exception, till Nero's fiery hate and Domitian's cold-blooded tyranny make Gentile persecution the rule. Hence the Philippian church is unique in its history until it drops out of history altogether, leaving scarcely a memorial behind.

It surpassed all the other apostolic churches in liberality and in fidelity to the simplicity of gospel doctrine, and these characteristics abide for all the years it remains in historic light. So Ignatius found it on his way to Roman martyrdom, and Polycarp in his letter to the Philippians could only imitate this letter of Paul. It was in this church, fol-

lowed by other churches among the Greeks, that the Christian woman comes into a prominence hardly possible where the Jewish element predominated, and the only rebuke in the letter, and that a very gentle one, seeks the reconciliation of two prominent women.

The characteristics of the letter are:

1. Pre-eminently it is a letter of joy. "I rejoice—ye rejoice," echoing the beatitude of our Lord, "Rejoice and be exceeding glad." Moreover, it is joy in sorrow, affliction and persecutions, as when the writer, while with them "sang praises at midnight," notwithstanding stripes, bonds, dungeons, and threatened death. Yet again, like the Sermon on the Mount, it gives a sovereign specific for happiness (4:6-9) whatever the outward circumstance.

2. It is interpenetrated with doctrines, not in formal statement as in Galatians, Romans and Hebrews, but in incidental allusion for practical ends. To the author it is an amazing thing that commentators should characterize it as the letter without doctrine. It goes far beyond Romans and Galatians in the sweep of its doctrinal teaching. It will surprise any student who attempts to make a list of its doctrines and compare them with the sum of the doctrines in other letters. The author surprised himself in that way, and after filling a page of legal cap, one doctrine to the line, he gave up the job, for his list would equal the sentences of the letter itself, and yet only four doctrines are stated elaborately—the doctrine of our Lord, 2:6-11; the doctrine of justification by faith, 3:1-10; the doctrine of perfection in soul and body, 3:11-14; the recipe for happiness, 4:6-8.

3. Because of its abundant and correlative doctrines, all applied practically, it has ever been a rich field for homiletics. It was this characteristic that led Robert Hall (with others) to select the whole letter for a series of expository sermons delighting himself and his audience. In preaching

from Romans, Galatians and Hebrews one cannot escape topical discussion, so perfect the system of truth, so closely connected and graded the argument, and so single the climax. But from Philippians we may cull a hundred fine and distinct themes for textual preaching, sometimes several in a single sentence. On this account also it is easy to give an analysis of Romans, Galatians and Hebrews, but quite difficult to give a satisfactory analysis of Philippians.

It is evident from many allusions that this church kept in closer touch with Paul than any other established by him. After leaving Ephesus Paul returned to Macedonia, Acts 20:1; II Cor. 2:12, 13; 8:5, 6. Still later, on leaving Corinth he returned to Philippi and there kept the passover, Acts 20:6. And it is every way probable that once at least after his release at Rome he visited this church. See Phil. 1:24, 25 and I Tim. 1:3. On the other hand, this church sent contributions to him twice while at Thessalonica, once at least while at Corinth, (II Cor. 11:9,) then here at Rome.

On the authenticity of this letter there is no room for reasonable doubt. The early historic testimony is abundant and clear. All the ancient versions contain it. Early in the second century Ignatius and Polycarp quote it and imitate it. Late in the second century Clement of Alexandria and Irenæus quote it, and somewhat later Tertullian bears direct testimony to it. Apart from all external evidence, the letter itself in spirit, style and genius attests itself.

But there is a proof in our day more satisfying to the individual soul than any of these. That proof is experimental. Whoever reads the letter as God's word and follows its direction finds in himself a verification; all its faith, joy, hope and love abide in him. The author has found by application of its doctrines and promises to his own heart demonstrations that it is God's book.

Of the post-apostolic history of this church only two

notable incidents are known, and both of these occurred but a few years after the death of John. The one was the great reception given by the church to Ignatius, the prisoner, on his way to martyrdom at Rome; the other was Polycarp's letter to the Philippians in reply to their request. Both were notable events, deeply impressing the hearts of the Philippians and long remembered. The letter of Polycarp, John's disciple, we find, somewhat abridged—in the Cambridge Bible. There are many quotations in it from our Lord and Paul. Apart from the quotations we find allusions, more or less direct, to New Testament writings in almost every sentence.

We may perhaps infer one important lesson from the silence of history henceforward concerning this most faithful of the apostolic churches—a lesson embodied in the proverb: "Blessed is the land that has no history." The point of the proverb lies in the fact that history is devoted mainly to great changes, convulsions, revolutions and crimes. The peaceful, happy life has no records. That church or man becomes most notorious that does unusual things and develops the most startling heresies. On this account the church historian finds it easier to trace departures from gospel order and life than conformity with them. The Roman apostasy leaves a broader and more sharply defined historic trail than all the faithful churches put together. The harlot is in the city clothed in purple and scarlet, while the true woman is nourished in the wilderness (Rev. 12:6; 17:1-8).

QUESTIONS

1. Of what group of Paul's letters is this one a part?
2. Name the letters in chronological order.
3. What general helps on the whole group?
4. What special helps on this book commended?
5. What two special remarks on this group?
6. What the importance of the group in distinct advance on preceding parts of New Testament?
7. What the importance, in view of the relations of these letters to both preceding and subsequent New Testament books?
8. What the importance of mastering this group of Paul's letters?
9. What is necessary in acquiring knowledge? Illustrate.
10. What questions must be answered relative to each book of this group?
11. Who the author, and what the proof?
12. Where written, and what the proof?
13. What the circumstances of the writer, and what their effect on the spread of the gospel?
14. What can you say of the date and the order in the group?
15. What the occasion?
16. To whom addressed?
17. Where do we find the history of the establishment of this church and its development up to the writing of this letter?
18. Restate the salient points of this history.
19. What the valuable lessons of the history?
20. What the peculiarities of this city and church, (1) as to civil government, (2) as to Jewish population, and (3) as to persecutions there?
21. Wherein did it surpass other apostolic churches?
22. What the position of women in this and other Greek churches?
23. What the great characteristics of this letter?
24. Why is it more difficult to give an analysis of Philippians than of Galatians and Romans?
25. Show from the history how Paul and this church kept in better touch with each other than was the case of most other churches.
26. What the evidence of the authenticity of this letter?
27. What two notable events only characterize the post-apostolic history of this church?
28. What the historic value of Polycarp's letter?
29. What important lesson may be inferred from the silence of subsequent history concerning this church? Illustrate by example.

XXIII

THE ANALYSIS AND EXPOSITION

Scripture: Phil. 1:1-30

ANALYSIS

1. The Opening Salutation, 1:1, 2. *Note: "Bishops and deacons"* and the bearing on the doctrine of church officers, comparing I Tim. 3:1-13.

2. *The Thanksgiving,* 1:3-7. In this Thanksgiving, note: (a) What constitutes "fellowship in the furtherance of the gospel," and how it makes the helpers "partakers of the grace." (b) The meaning of "The day of Jesus Christ." (c) The meaning of "The good work begun in us," and contrast with the work done for us. (d) God's perfecting the work begun in us until *that day,* and compare I Thess. 5:23.

3. *The Prayer,* 1:8-11.

4. *The Account of His State in Prison,* 1:12-30. In this account, note: (1) The Word of God is not bound. The chains on Paul are wings to his gospel. (a) Many soldiers of the Prætorian guard to whom, in turn, Paul was chained thus hear and are saved, who never otherwise would have heard, 4:22. (b) Each saved soldier tells the news to his comrades. (c) His friends, who left the work to Paul free, take up the work for Paul bound. (d) Some Judaizing Christians, stirred by the opportunity of his bonds to press their view of the gospel, preach through strife some truth of Christ. (2) The meaning of these expressions: (a) "Set for the defence of the gospel." (b) "Christ magnified by life or death." (c) "The supply of the Spirit of

Christ." (d) "To live is Christ—to die is gain." (e) "The strait betwixt two." (f) "I know that I shall abide"—how?

5. *Exhortation—part I,* 1:27—2:4. Note the expressions: (a) "In nothing affrighted by the adversaries." (b) The double "token" in 1:28, comparing II Thess. 1:5. (c) "Granted to suffer."

6. The Great Example of Our Lord, and the doctrines involved concerning His deity, original glory, voluntary renunciation, humiliation, sacrifice, exaltation and restoration to glory, 2:5-11. *Note:* (a) Meaning of "form of God." (b) Meaning of "counted not equality with God a thing to be grasped." (c) Meaning of "emptied himself."

7. *Exhortation—part II,* 2:12-18. *Note:* (a) The salvation in us compared with the salvation out of us, or regeneration and sanctification over against expiation and justification. (b) Concerning the internal salvation that we work out what God works in, but concerning the external salvation we put on what Christ worked out, 3:12, 14. (c) "Lights in the world." (d) "Holding forth the word of life." (e) "The libation on the sacrifice," verse 27.

8. Concerning Timothy, 2:19-24.

9. Concerning Epaphroditus, 2:25-30.

10. Exhortation—concluded, 3:1.

11. Concision of the flesh vs. circumcision of the spirit, or the enemies of the cross of Christ, 3:2, 18, 19. See John 3:6, 7; Gal. 4:22-31; 5:6-24; Rom. 7:5-15; Col. 2:11-23.

12. The doctrine of justification, negatively and positively, 3:4-9. *Note:* "The excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord."

13. The doctrine of sanctification and how attained, 3:10-14, and 2:12, 13. *Note:* (a) The meaning of "attain unto the resurrection from the dead." (b) The meaning of "laying hold on all for which Christ laid hold on me." (c) "Forgetting things behind and stretching forward to

things before." (d) "The high calling." (e) "The goal." (f) "The prize."

14. The doctrine of the glorification of the body, 3:21. See I John 3:2 and I Cor. 15:35-49, for the dead, and I Cor. 15:50-54, for the living.

15. Citizenship in heaven as contrasted with the Philippian citizenship in Rome, 3:20, and compare Eph. 2:19 as contrasted with citizenship in Jerusalem.

16. Paul's joy and crown, 4:1. See I Thess. 2:19, 20.

17. Women to the front for strife or work, 4:2, 3.

18. The Yoke-fellow, 4:3.

19. The book of life, 4:3.

20. "Rejoice always—rejoice," 4:4.

21. "The Lord is at hand." What does it mean? 4:4, and compare Jas. 5:8, 9.

22. The great recipe for happiness, 4:6-9.

23. A great Christian sacrifice and its effect, 4:10-18.

24. Benediction and closing salutation, 4:20-23. *Note:* Cæsar's household.

EXPOSITION

Address and opening salutation, 1:1, 2.—Paul associates Timothy with himself in addressing this letter, because Timothy, having been associated with him in the establishment of the church, had their welfare at heart, as they had good reason to know, and because he purposes to send him as a forerunner of his own coming (2:19-23). There is here no assertion of his apostolic claims, as in some other letters, because at Philippi these had never been questioned, but he assumes for himself and Timothy only the title of "bondservants of Jesus Christ." The letter is addressed to all the saints in the city, and only inclusively to the "bishops and deacons." It is significant that in no other letter are the church officers included in the address. As the centuries pass church officers grow in importance and the church de-

clines. This text has always been regarded as a proof that in apostolic churches there were only two offices—bishop and deacon—particularly when reinforced by the stronger proof in I Tim. 3:1-13, where in the most formal way the qualifications of church officers are set forth. We confront, therefore, in this address four doctrines of ecclesiology, namely:

1. The particular church is more important than the officers, including them, and retaining jurisdiction over them, and indeed capable of existence without them.

2. While apostles, prophets and evangelists are set in the church, for kingdom purposes, the only officers charged with local duties in a particular church are two.

3. There are no grades in the ministry notwithstanding the later innovations of the Roman, Greek and English hierarchies. *Note:* The reader should study Lightfoot's argument on this point in his "Commentary on Philippians."

4. There was here, as in other churches, a plurality of bishops the meaning of which deserves special consideration.

All of these doctrines are important, and ecclesiastical history clearly shows how most harmful innovations gradually destroyed the simplicity of the New Testament teaching on the church. Baptists and Presbyterians unite in contesting the Romanist, Greek, English and the Methodist orders in the ministry, and then differ from each other on the distinction between teaching and ruling elders. Just here the author would commend to the reader the "Doctrine of the Church," as set forth in his discussion of "Distinctive Baptist Principles," pp. 9-14.

But briefly now note that in Acts 20:17, 28 "the elders of the church" at Ephesus are also called "bishops." They are not distinct offices or grades in the ministry. A preacher may be called a *kerux,* herald, on acount of his business to proclaim the gospel. He may be called *presbuteros,* elder,

to indicate his official position in the church. He may be called *episcopos,* bishop, to note his overseeing or ruling the work of the church. He may be called "pastor" or "shepherd," to denote his duties of leading, feeding and defending the flock. He may be called "ambassador" (though this term more particularly refers to apostles) to denote that he represents Christ, in declaring the terms of reconciliation with God. It is certain that these terms do not teach different orders in the ministry.

On the plurality of elders or bishops in a single church we may note these passages: (1) In the Jerusalem church, Acts 11:30; 15:6, 22, 23; 21:18. (2) In the Ephesus church, Acts 20:17 and I Tim. 5:17, 19. (3) In the Philippian church, Phil. 1:1. (4) In other churches, Acts 14:23. Several questions here arise:

1. What is the office of elder? Is he a preacher? The answer is clear that he is a preacher. The Presbyterians, relying on I Tim. 5:17, make a distinction between "teaching elders" who are preachers and "ruling elders" who constitute a "governing board" in every church. And on the term, "elder" (Greek *presbuteros*), they base their whole system of federal government. The passage in Timothy must be put to hard service to warrant such vast conclusions.

Paul has been discussing the pensioning of certain aged widows whose services had been signal for the cause, and then adds that elders who had been good bishops (rulers) should receive double compensation, particularly if they had been equally serviceable in teaching and preaching. In other words, he is discussing the duty of the church to care for its superannuated workers, whether widows or preachers, according to the value of their past public services. It is an undue straining of his words to interpret two distinct classes of elders. We fairly meet all the meaning of all the passages when we say that wherever a church was organ-

ized, all who had the recognized call to preach were ordained, whether one or a score. Of course some one of these preachers would be selected as pastor of the congregation, but all the preachers in the church would help in the work, each according to his gifts, in teaching, preaching and overseeing the work of the church.

Many Baptist churches of today, particularly in cities, have in their membership a plurality of these elders. Of course only one can be officially pastor. Mr. Spurgeon, however, had an "official board of elders" in his church. And others have thought that such ought to be the rule in our churches, if for no other reason, to side-track a ruling board of deacons, who ought to be restricted to their care of the temporalities of the church.

The Thanksgiving, 1:3-7.—This thanksgiving is remarkable for its use of the terms, "all," "always," and "every," and bears very high testimony to this exceptional church. He thanks God upon "all" his remembrance of them, being able to recall nothing bad about them, and "always" in "every prayer" for them—every prayer being one of joy, on account of one thing.

We do well to consider that ground of exceptional thanksgiving. It was "their fellowship with him in the furtherance of the gospel" by which they "became partakers of the grace." He refers to their continuous help toward him ever since he led them to Christ. Other churches might be ungrateful—they never were. Others might fail to see that whoever helped the preacher had an investment in all his work of which they could not be robbed. They preached through Paul, and shared his glory and reward. What a lesson here to those who are not preachers. The idea came from our Lord himself: "Whoever receiveth a prophet shall have a prophet's reward," and is thus admirably expressed by John in regard to Gaius: "Beloved, thou doest a faithful work in whatsoever thou doest toward them that

are brethren and strangers withal; who bare witness to thy love before the church: whom thou wilt do well to set forward on their journey worthily of God: because that for the sake of the Name they went forth, taking nothing of the Gentiles. We therefore ought to welcome such, that we may be fellowworkers for the truth." Gaius and Diotrephes represent the missionary and the anti-missionary of apostolic times.

In this glorious way all members of the church may become missionary preachers. See for other examples the women who helped our Lord, and those who helped Paul. Romans 16:1-4; See Paul's extension of this thanksgiving thought in 4:10, 14-18. The next thought in the thanksgiving is the time when these fellow-helpers partake of the apostolic grace and reap the fruition of their sacrifices. He says, "In the day of Jesus Christ." This is the day of His final advent when He rewards all His saints for their good works. See I Cor. 3:11-15; Rev. 22:12; Luke 6:23; Mark 9:41.

This good work of the Philippians originated in God's grace, who not only began it in them, but will perfect it by fruition of reward in the day of Christ. Note the meaning of "began a good work in you." I regret that this exposition of the passage robs me of one of my early sermons, and it may so rob you. The idea is not that what He begins He will continue to the end, but what He originates that will He crown with perfection in the reward of the judgment. While the primary reference here is that God whose grace began this good work of helping the missionary will put the crown of perfection on it when He rewards His people, yet it may be applied to any other work of grace in the heart. It will not be a broken, unfinished column—a stream lost in the desert. What God commences He completes. Let us particularly note the preposition, "until." It should be rendered "at" as in I Thess. 5:23.

The idea is not of continuing until a given time, but perfecting and crowning at a given time, *i. e.*, the day of Jesus Christ.

We will now look at his prayer. In chapter 1 from verses 8 to 11, we get a real continuance. He now prays that all these graces in their hearts may be continued and abound. That is what he prays for, that their love may become more fervent. We pray the right thing for a Christian when we pray for his growth in grace; when we pray for an expansion of his love; when we pray for an enlargement of his horizon. If he lives low down in the valley, let us take him on the wings of our prayer to the top of the mountain and let him see what a big world it is, and keep himself from narrow thoughts and a narrow life. That is the substance of his prayer.

The fourth point of the analysis is the account of his state in prison. He tells them, first of all, and it is a glorious thing, that men may put a chain on Paul, but they can't chain his love and his faith and his hope. They may bind him and confine him, but they can't put chains on the gospel. The shackles become wings to the gospel. It tends to the furtherance of the gospel, just as the blood of the martyr becomes the seed of the church.

This was accomplished in this way: The emperor's guard, called the Prætorian Guard, had charge of the State prisoners, and one sentinel every day (and perhaps two) was chained to Paul—Paul's right hand to the sentinel's left hand. Where Paul walked he walked; whatever Paul said he heard; whomsoever Paul received he saw, and to whatever was said he was a listener. I have sometimes thought that it would be a good thing if there was some way of chaining up some other people I know to make them hear the Word of God. They never will come any other way.

Some of these soldiers were saved, and they told their comrades. Then his friends, looking at him, the great mis-

sionary to the Gentiles, held in bondage, unable to go about, thinking of Spain and other ends of the world and of revisiting the churches that he had established—these friends of his who had left the work for him to do when free—are now stirred up to take hold themselves when Paul is bound.

Then there were some enemies of his—Christians too, Judaizing members of these Roman churches—stirred by the opportunity of his bonds, who now press their views of the gospel. As if they said, "When Paul was free we had no chance to give our views, but Paul is tied now, and this is our chance to present our side of it," and they did present their side of it, preaching some truth. We had the most signal example that ever came before the world, I think, here in Texas. We remember the strife that was stirred up, and I am quite sure that these people are doing harder work now than they ever did when they were in Convention. They feel a responsibility on them to make good their claim, and I rejoice, for most of them are good people, strangely misled on some points, but as Paul said, "I rejoice that Christ is preached."

QUESTIONS

1. Give an analysis of the letter.
2. Why does Paul associate Timothy with him in the address?
3. What four doctrines of ecclesiology are involved in the address?
4. Prove that "elder" and "bishop" are not two distinct offices, but express different ideas of the one office.
5. Give three examples of New Testament churches having a plurality of elders or bishops, and one general passage expressing the custom.
6. Cite several names applied to the preacher expressing, not different orders in the ministry, but different ideas of one office.
7. Upon what issue do Baptists and Presbyterians unite against Romanist, Greek, English and Methodist denominations?
8. On what passage do Presbyterians rely to prove a distinction between "teaching elders" and "ruling elders," and how do you expound the passage so as to rebut their contention?
9. What noted Baptist preacher had in his church a board of "ruling elders?"

10. When the apostles "ordained elders in every church" how do you prove that these were all preachers, and not a board of ruling laymen?

11. What other denominations besides the Presbyterians have boards of "ruling elders" who are not preachers?

12. What the one great ground of Paul's thanksgiving in this letter?

13. What do you understand the passage to mean, and cite a parallel passage from John?

14. What is meant by "partakers of the grace," and cite a parallel passage from our Lord?

15. When is this partaking realized, and what is meant by "the day of Jesus Christ?"

16. Rob yourselves of a big sermon by expounding "He who began a good work in you will perfect it at the day of Jesus Christ," and cite a parallel passage to prove that "until" should be "at," and other scriptures to prove that rewards of Christians are bestowed at that time.

17. In giving an account of his prison-state, show how the apostle proves that his bonds gave wings to the gospel.

XXIV

GOD'S PROVIDENCE IN PAUL'S LIFE

Scripture: Phil. 1:12—2:5

IN the account of his prison condition, 1:12-30, there are some expressions that need explanation. He says, "They, knowing that I am set for the defense of the gospel * * *"—and he was. Whoever touched the fringe of the doctrine of the gospel of Jesus Christ to destroy it or to make light of it had Paul to fight. All over the world the spirit of Paul as a stalwart soldier stood between the pure, simple gospel of Jesus Christ and a Judaizing tendency that would have made Christianity merely a Jewish sect, and in the same way he stood against every other error. He loved the gospel. Every promise of it was dear to him and every doctrine was sacred. He would not yield the width of a hair on a principle. "Set for the defense of the gospel." I know some who are *set,* but they are not set for the defense of the gospel. They are set in favor of every loose view of doctrine and polity.

Then his assurance of escaping death at this time: "For I *know* that this shall turn out to my salvation * * * And having this confidence, I *know* that I shall abide, yea, and abide with you all." This is not hope nor conjecture, but positive knowledge through inward assurance of the Holy Spirit as in Acts 20:23: "The Holy Spirit testifieth unto me in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me." See another case of the reception of positive spiritual knowledge in Acts 27:22-25. Indeed, he expressly says that the means of his preservation are their prayers and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ.

The context here seems to demand that "salvation," (Greek, *soteria*) as in some other instances, (see the Greek of Acts 27:34) means bodily preservation or salvation from physical death. The "supply of the Spirit" means that overruling power exercised by the Spirit which wards off impending peril as in Acts 18:9, 10; II Cor. 1:9, 10. Mark that here the Holy Spirit is called the "Spirit of Christ" because He is Christ's *alter ego*—other self—as in John 14:18: "I will not leave you orphans; I will come unto you," and yet this coming was in the Holy Spirit, whom Jesus, as well as the Father, sent as His vicar when He ascended to heaven. See John 15:26.

This case of the efficacy of the Philippian prayers, instrumentally averting Paul's death at this time, should sink deep into our hearts. They prayed that Paul might escape death. The supply of the Spirit comes as the means through which deliverance is effected. Seneca and Burrus, Nero's advisers and delegates in examining State prisoners, are unconscious of supernatural interposition, and yet in His own strange way, the Holy Spirit brings it about that Paul is acquitted at this time.

Not that Paul's death at that time would have frustrated the glory of his Lord, for he himself testified that Christ would be magnified by either his life or death, nor that extension of life to Paul would be a favor, for to him personally death would be a gain and life a continued crucifixion, but that his life just yet would be for the progress of the gospel and the confirmation of the saints.

Looking at the alternatives—"To live is Christ, to die is gain"—Paul personally was in "a strait betwixt the two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better for me: nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." His own desire for rest and glory was to find gratification in death, which was but a door opening into heaven and the presence of the Lord, whereas

to live was to go on suffering like his Lord. But when he saw that his living meant good to the cause, he unselfishly renounced the pleasure of death.

This is not the first time in his history of his suffering that for the sake of others he welcomed the pain of living. In the second letter to the Corinthians he says, "For we know that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens. For verily in this we groan, longing to be clothed upon with our habitation which is from heaven. * * * For indeed we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but that we would be clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life. * * * Being therefore always of good courage, and knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord (for we walk by faith, not by sight); we are of good courage, I say, and are willing rather to be absent from the body, and be at home with the Lord," II Cor. 5:1, 2, 4, 6-9.

Exhortation, part I, 1:27—2:4.—This first part of the exhortation is directed to one great end: "Only let your manner of life be worthy of the gospel of Christ." The common version renders it "conversation" instead of "manner of life." The author greatly prefers a more literal rendering than either: "Live your citizen life," otherwise we miss the delicate allusion to the Roman citizenship enjoyed by the Philippian colony, and the higher allusion to Christian citizenship in the New Jerusalem. This harmonizes the passage with the context, 3:20: "For our citizenship is in heaven, etc.," and puts it in line with the great passage in Ephesians 2:11-19, which treats of the "fellow-citizens with the saints."

It is related of S. S. Prentiss that just after he had electrified the nation by his great speech before Congress in the contest for his seat in that body, in which he emphasized

the thought that to deny him his seat was to disfranchise Mississippi and rob it of its most glorious heritage, he was invited by ardent admirers to deliver an address in New York City, on which occasion his only theme was his first word—"Fellow-Citizens." Earth never heard a greater oration, and every man in the audience was lifted to a conception of American citizenship high as the shining stars. The sonorous roll of his magical voice in the mere prolonged pronunciation of the oft repeated word "Fellow-Citizens" was compared to the archangel's trumpet. He was greater than Cicero against Verres, who declared that earth's highest honor was to be able to say, "I am a Roman citizen" and earth's meanest tyrant and greatest robber was one who arbitrarily stripped an accused man of that privilege.

In Acts we see Paul himself, at this very Philippi, and again at Jerusalem (Acts 16:37, 38 and 22:25), terrify his persecutors by his claim of Roman citizenship. All this goes to emphasize his one great exhortation: "Live your citizen life worthy of the gospel, whether I come to see you or be absent." He then shows just how the exhortation may be carried out:

1. "Stand fast in one Spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of [*i. e.* the truth of] the gospel." This is an exhortation to unity so marvelously elaborated in Ephesians 4:1-6: "I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech you to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all."

2. "In nothing terrified by your adversaries." The exhortation is most timely because the Philippian Christians

were persecuted at this time as Paul had been when with them. Indeed, they commenced their Christian life in a fiery furnace which had never cooled. We see Paul's glorious tribute to them in a previous letter: "Moreover, brethren, we make known to you the grace of God which hath been given in the churches of Macedonia; how that in much proof of affliction the abundance of their joy, and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality. For according to their power, I bear witness, yea, and beyond their power, they gave of their own accord, beseeching us with much entreaty in regard of this grace and the fellowship in the ministering to the saints: and this, not as we had hoped, but first they gave their own selves to the Lord, and to us through the will of God," II Cor. 8:1-5. To encourage them to follow the exhortation he assigns three reasons:

1. The infliction of the persecution was a token of the damnation of their persecutors.

2. Their endurance of the persecution was a God-given token of their salvation, echoing the beatitudes of our Lord: "Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets that were before you," Matt. 5:10-12.

3. This suffering therefore in behalf of Christ was a special privilege granted to favored saints. They had seen Paul endure the same conflict, and elsewhere he thus enumerates and glories in his afflictions: "Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as one beside himself) I more; in labors more abundantly, in prisons more abundantly, in stripes above measure, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten

with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of rivers, in perils of robbers, in perils from my countrymen, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in labor and travail, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Besides those things that are without, there is that which presseth upon me daily, anxiety for all the churches. Who is weak, and I am not weak? who is caused to stumble, and I burn not? If I must needs glory, I will glory of the things that concern my weakness," II Cor. 11:23-30; and, "And He hath said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my power is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my weaknesses, that the power of Christ may rest upon me. Wherefore I take pleasure in weaknesses, in injuries, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong," II Cor. 12:9, 10.

He then clinches the exhortation to unity and unselfishness by five other mighty considerations: (1) "If there be any comfort in Christ, (2) if there be any consolation of love, (3) if there be any fellowship of the Spirit, (4) if there be any tender mercies and compassions, (5) if you wish to fulfill my joy, then seek after this unity, without faction, or vainglory, and in lowliness of mind." This method of hypothetical statement has all the force of positive affirmation having no suggestion of doubt.

He then advances to a sixth reason grander than all the others—the example of our Lord: " Let this mind be in you which was also in our Lord Jesus Christ." Indeed, "If any man have not the Spirit of the Lord he is none of His."

QUESTIONS

1. Explain "set for the defense of the gospel."
2. How did Paul know that he would escape death as a result of his first Roman imprisonment, and what other examples of this knowledge?
3. What is the meaning of "salvation" (Greek, *Soteria*) in this passage, and what other example of similar use of this word?
4. What is meant by "the supply of the Spirit" through which he would escape, and what other instances?
5. Why is the Holy Spirit called "the Spirit of Christ?"
6. To what, instrumentally, is this supply of the Spirit granted, and what the value of the lesson?
7. Who at this time were Nero's advisers and delegates in examining prisoners of state?
8. Were they conscious of supernatural intervention in their acquittal of Paul?
9. Why would not Paul's death at this time frustrate the glory of Christ, why was not the extension of his life a personal favor to him, and why then was he spared at this time?
10. Explain Paul's "strait betwixt two," why was the decision to live unselfish on his part, and what other instance of his life similar to this?
11. What the one great end of his exhortation in 1:27—2:4?
12. Give the rendering of the passage in both common and revised versions, and why is the author's suggestion a better rendering?
13. Cite a passage of similar meaning in Ephesians.
14. Relate the incident of S. S. Prentiss and of Cicero, illustrating.
15. In what two incidents is Paul an illustration?
16. How does he suggest the carrying out of his exhortation?
17. Show the timeliness of the exhortation.
18. Show from another letter Paul's tribute to their endurance of afflictions, and where do we find his statement of his own case illustrating what he here enjoins?
19. What three encouragements does he give to enforce his exhortation?
20. In what other letter does he similarly use the word "token?"
21. How does he clinch his exhortation?
22. What a sixth and greater reason?

XXV

THE DEITY OF CHRIST

Scripture: Phil. 2:5-11

ATTENTION was called, at the close of the preceding chapter, to that highest of all motives to unity, humility and self-renunciation—the example of our Lord Jesus Christ in His voluntarily divesting himself of the glory and prerogatives of His heavenly estate, and His assumption of a human nature in order to secure our salvation and the highest glory of the Father. We may here, if anywhere, pause to reflect on Paul's uniform method of preaching doctrine, never as a mere theory, but always with a practical end in view. His exhortations to obedience and morality and unselfish love are all based on a solid foundation of doctrine. The senseless modern cry, "Let us have more humanity, more morality and less dogma," was to him as unthinkable as a house without foundation, or a stream without a source. On the other hand, mere abstract dogma, or theoretic theology, without reforming power on the life, was but as sounding brass or tinkling cymbal. Between his dogmatic theology and a holy life was an essential and indissoluble relation.

The doctrines involved in Phil. 2:5-11.—This is by far the greatest and most instructive passage in the letter, and the second most important in the whole Bible, especially if it be considered, as it must be, with the parallel passages —John 1:1-5, 9, 14; Col. 1:15-20; Heb. 1:2-13—because it expresses the LOVE of the SON for sinful man, and His honor toward the Father. Only one other outranks it, John 3:16, which expresses the FATHER'S LOVE toward

sinful man, and only one other comes next to it, Rom. 15:30, "The LOVE of the SPIRIT" expressed in the deeds of John 14-16. The three embody the Love of the Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

Strangely enough, Aryans and Socinians rely on this passage to make good their denial of our Lord's essential deity, saying, "He counted not equality with God a thing to be grasped, and His exaltation was an achievement and not inherent," and one party of the Gnostics cite it in denial of His real humanity, saying, "He had only the form, or likeness, of a man," and the destructive critics quote it to support their undervaluation of our Lord's testimony to the integrity and inspiration of the Old Testament, saying, "He emptied himself, and hence His views of the Old Testament have no more authority than the views of any other pious Jew of His time."

There are some real difficulties in the passage, but none that affect its incalculable value as revealing our Lord's essential deity and humanity, and His great work of human redemption. The refinements and subtilities of scholarly critics in handling this passage, and their infinitesimal details of divergence, constituting a vast and tedious literature, accentuate the proverb: "The more I know of expert scholarship the more I like common sense." And yet, (I state it for the reader's satisfaction,) the best of them and the bulk of them of all ages, nations and denominations, coincide in their conclusion that the passage does teach what the average mind gathers in a moment, the existence of our Lord prior to His incarnation, His equality in nature with the Father, His real humanity, His great work of redemption on the cross, His consequent exaltation to universal sovereignty, and His restoration to original glory.

It is my purpose here to state briefly the main points of the teaching of the passage, referring somewhat to the differences of interpretation. While I bear in mind that this is

a study in New Testament English and so must not encroach on the domain of New Testament Greek, yet, without pedantry, I must refer to certain Greek words which underlie all the various English renderings. So touching this phase lightly, I name the crucial Greek words of the text, which are as follows:

1. *Morphe,* translated "form," *e.g.,* "existing in the form of God, taking the form of a man," verses 6 and 7.
2. *Huparchōn,* rendered "existing," "subsisting," or better still, "originally subsisting," verse 6.
3. *Harpagmon,* rendered "robbery" in common version; "prize" in the Canterbury Revision; "a thing to be grasped" in the American Standard Revision; "something to be clung to," in the Twentieth Century, verse 6.
4. *Ekenosen,* rendered "emptied" himself.
5. *Homoiomati* rendered "likeness of men," verse 7.
6. *Schēmati,* rendered "fashion of men."

The Twentieth Century translation thus renders the whole passage: "Let the Spirit of Jesus be yours also. Though from the beginning He had the divine nature, yet He did not look upon equality with God as something to be clung to, but impoverished himself by taking the nature of a servant, and becoming like other men. Then He appeared among us as a man, and still further humbled himself by submitting himself even to death, yes, death on the cross! And this is why God raised Him to the very highest place, and gave Him the Name which ranks above all others, so that in honor of the name of Jesus every knee should bend, in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, and that every tongue should acknowledge Jesus Christ as Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

Observe three merits of this Twentieth Century rendering:

1. It alone brings out the true meaning of *huparchōn,* namely, "From the beginning." The word certainly means

"originally existing, or subsisting," like John's "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God."

2. Its "impoverished himself" instead of "emptied himself" brings the passage in line with a previous statement of the same general fact by Paul: "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might become rich," II Cor. 8:9.

3. The rendering is in smooth running, every day English. Observe also that the only difference between the common version and the revised version on the one hand, and the American Standard, Bible Union (edited), and the Twentieth Century on the other hand in rendering the noun *harpagmon,* does not affect the deity of our Lord, for all teach that, but only the time when the "emptying" commences, for if the American Standard be right, then the emptying commenced in the thought of the Son when He counted not equality with God a thing to be grasped, the emptying merely resulting from the thought.

The author believes that the common version more closely follows the grammatical construction, for *harpagmon* has the active sense, while the rendering, "a thing to be grasped," being passive, would call for another form of the noun, *harpagma.*

In other words, the American Standard derives its rendering, not from the form of the noun, but from what it regards as a contextual demand. The only other use of the word in Greek literature, sacred or profane, is its employment by Plutarch "On the education of boys" where it has the active sense. Hence the earlier scholars and versions, and the most conservative modern scholars, sustain the common version. But all these renderings agree in attributing essential deity to our Lord, if not by positive affirmation, at least by the strongest implication. The idea

of the expression "form of God" may be gathered from a comparison with other Pauline expressions, "The express image of His person," "the effulgence of His glory," and with the *Logos* of John.

From the author's sermon before the Southern Baptist Convention, 1908, this passage is cited:

"HIS RELATIONS TO THE FATHER

"These relations are expressed in the words image, effulgence, form, *Logos,* Son. When out text says, 'Who is the image of the invisible God,' and another passage says, 'The very image of His substance,' it cannot mean less than that He is the visible of the invisible God.

"To illustrate: Philip said, 'Lord, show us the Father and it sufficeth us.' He replied, 'When thou hast seen me thou hast seen the Father.' And when it is said, 'Who being the effulgence of God's glory,' is not that, at least, the raying forth, the outshining of the divine glory which must be another way of saying, 'He is the visible of the invisible?'

"Of kindred meaning is the expression, 'Existing in the *form* of God.' Form is the apparent, the phenomenal. So *Logos,* or the Word, is the revelation of the Father's mind, heart and will, the unveiling of the hidden. Of like purport is the declaration: 'In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead *bodily.*'

"But we must hark continually back to His nature—'the Word was God,'—lest by the weakness of the terms image, effulgence, form and *Logos,* we account Him only a manifestation."

We may rest assured that Paul's teaching here concerning our Lord must be construed in harmony with His teachings in Colossians and Ephesians written such a short time later.

It is needful to give a word of caution against interpreting

too much or too little into the *Kenosis,* "He emptied himself," A. V., "Made himself of no reputation." There is no room for dogmatism in a matter necessarily so mysterious, but—

1. It is certain that He did not divest himself of His deity, for then He would not be the God-man, nor could it be said, "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead *bodily.*"

2. We know that He laid aside His heavenly glory, for He prays: "And now, Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was," John 17:5.

3. We know that He laid aside the riches of that heavenly estate, as Paul says, "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be made rich," II Cor. 8:9.

4. We know that He laid aside His equality with the Father, completely subordinating His own will to the will of the Father: "Not my will but thine be done," "I came to do the will of Him that sent me," and became a bond-servant.

5. We know that He did not resort to His inherent omnipotence to work miracles in His own behalf, or to avert disaster from himself, or to relieve himself from the perplexities and burdens of a real humanity. Indeed, all His miracles were wrought by the power of the Holy Spirit.

6. In the same way He relied on the Holy Spirit, whom He received without measure at His baptism, for His superhuman knowledge. The inspiration of all the prophets was less than His. "He knew what was in man," and spoke by infallible authority of all the Old Testament books. So that the radical critics but advertise their own folly and infidelity in undervaluation of His testimony concerning Old Testament books and their meaning. No matter how

far He emptied himself of His own inherent omniscience, that in no way affects the testimony of one who received the Spirit without measure. All the resources of Deity were at His command, through the Spirit, so far as they bore upon His mission.

The key passage, in interpreting His original status, and the emptying himself, is the preceding verse: "Not looking each of you to his own things, but each of you also to the things of others. Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus." Christ did not look to His own things, *i. e.*, His equality with the Father, and the riches and glory of His heavenly state, but "emptied himself, etc." Here again we must be cautious of putting too much stress on the word, "emptied," for it is Paul himself who only a little later affirms: "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." The "emptying" is not absolute, but only a temporary and voluntary suspension of exercise, a holding in abeyance for the time being. It was doubtless this consideration that influenced the conservative translators of the common version to thus render the passage, "Made himself of no reputation."

His Humiliation consisted:

1. In His incarnation, *i. e.*, taking "the form of a bond-servant," and rendering absolute obedience to the will of the Father.
2. An obedience even unto death.
3. Yea, the death of the cross.

In this obedience He not only magnified the law in its precepts, demonstrating that it was holy, just and good, but also magnified its penal sanctions, by "bearing in His own body the sin of the world."

His Exaltation consisted:

1. In His resurrection, thereby demonstrating all His high claims asserted in His lifetime, and demanding that angels who had worshiped Him in His original glory and

in His incarnation should now worship His glorified humanity, Heb. 1:6.

2. His ascension and reception into heaven.

3. His enthronement there as King of kings and Lord of lords, and His anointing with the oil of gladness above His fellows.

4. His session there until all His enemies are made His footstool, Psalms 110:1, and until He comes as final judge at the last and great and general judgment.

5. At which time every knee bends to Him, and every tongue confesses that He is Lord.

Two things in this exaltation call for further explanation:

1. The Name that is above every name, what is it? Is it the name, *Jesus,* or the name *of Jesus,* a new name bestowed on Jesus? Two reasons oppose the former, namely:

1. His name "Jesus" was given at His incarnation, but this is a name given at His exaltation, and expressive of it.

2. If the writer meant the name, "Jesus," then it would seem that this word should have been in the dative, but "Jesus" is in the genitive and the expression is "in the name of Jesus." The author thinks that the name given to Jesus is, as expressed in Rev. 19:16, "King of kings and Lord of lords," which is expressive of His exaltation.

2. What is meant by "every knee" and "every tongue?" When does this take place? The expression in its context, calls for the highest degree of universality, and can mean no less than every human being, good and bad, and every angel, good and fallen, without exception in either case. It means that all of them will recognize and confess His universal sovereignty. All this will occur at His final advent when He shall sit on the white throne of the general judgment and shall fix the final status of all moral intelligences. This is indeed an achievement, not by the Son as originally subsisting, but by the Son veiled in humanity and obedient unto death.

QUESTIONS

1. What Paul's method of presenting doctrine?
2. How would he have regarded the modern cry, "Give us more humanity and morality and less dogma," and the custom of some to present theology as an abstract system?
3. What can you say of the rank of the passage, Phil. 2:5-11, and what two others may be classed with it, and why?
4. What three heresies are strangely drawn from this passage?
5. What the crucial Greek words of the passage, and how rendered in American Standard Revision?
6. What three excellencies in the "Twentieth Century" rendering?
7. What two examples of usage only in Greek literature of *harpagmon,* and what its form in both, active and passive, what the renderings in the English versions cited, which the most grammatical, and why do the others adopt the passive form?
8. What the only practical difference between these renderings, and their effect on the teachings of the passage as to Christ's original deity?
9. What the idea of the various terms, "form," "image," "effulgence" and *Logos?*
10. What caution given in interpreting "He emptied himself?"
11. Was this emptying absolute, and if not, what?
12. Cite six particulars as expressive of the "emptying," negative and positive.
13. What the key passage in interpreting this paragraph?
14. In what did His humiliation consist?
15. In what did His exaltation consist?
16. What the Name above every name, and why?
17. What the meaning of "every knee" and "every tongue?"
18. When this "bending of every knee" and "confession of every tongue?"

XXVI

PAUL'S LIBATION AND THE CHRISTIAN'S GROWTH IN GRACE

Scripture: Phil. 2:12—3:14

SALVATION in us, Phil. 2:12-18. This paragraph, like the foregoing one, is a part of the exhortation commencing: "Live your citizen life," 1:27. Take it all in all, it is the highest model of exhortation in all literature. An aged Baptist cannot read it without a sigh of regret over our pulpit decadence in the power of exhortation—a power like an electric storm bringing into rapid play all the elemental forces of land and sky, a spiritual storm that hurled doctrines as thunderbolts on the head while seismic upheavals shook the foundations under the feet. When we recall the rugged and doctrinal forcefulness of our less cultivated fathers, our own tame, mild and polite exhortations are as the cooing of a fledgling dove compared with the roaring of a Numidian lion. Alas! The exhorter has left us! This mighty special gift of the Spirit (Rom. 12:8) is no more coveted and honored among us.

It would pay us to swap off a lot of our weak preachers for a few old-time exhorting deacons. Teaching appeals to the head; exhortation to the heart. Teaching instructs; exhortation applies. Teaching illumines; exhortation awakens and stirs; it rings alarm bells, kindles beacon-flames on the mountains, fires signal guns, blows trumpets, unfurls war-flags and beats the bass drum. But exhortation is only harmless thunder without the lightning bolt of doctrine. We must not mistake "hollerin'" for exhorta-

tion, nor perspiration for inspiration. O that this generation could have heard J. W. D. Creath, Micajah Cole, Deacon Pruitt and Judge A. S. Broadus exhort in great revival meetings, while strong men wept, enemies became reconciled, and love illumined and beautified rugged, homely faces! Then as Christian fire attained a white heat, the lost soul, pierced through and through by fiery arrows of conviction, cried out: "God be merciful to me the sinner," or, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?"

> "And Heaven came down our souls to greet,
> And glory crowned the Mercy Seat."

It must be understood that this exhortation from first to last is addressed to Christians—to citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem. It is not an exhortation to sinners to flee from the wrath to come—not an appeal to the lost to accept by simple faith, without works, the salvation done for us in expiation and justification, but to Christians to work out the salvation of sanctification, God's prevenient grace working in us, both to will and to work, for His good pleasure.

This letter, more than any other, sharply distinguishes between the external and internal salvation. The external salvation is complete expiation of sin by the Son alone, eternal and irreversible justification by the Father alone, and the internal salvation is regeneration, sanctification and glorification by the Holy Spirit alone. The Spirit gives life to the soul in regeneration; that life is developed and perfected in sanctification. Our working out salvation is in co-operating with the Spirit in developing and perfecting the life commenced in regeneration. As a means or merit towards justification our works are an offence toward God and a blasphemous attempt to usurp the office of our Lord Jesus Christ. See Rom. 2:27, 28. Furthermore, as a means or merit toward regeneration, works on our part are an offence toward God, as Paul testifies later, Eph. 2:4-10,

and Titus 3:4, 5. Regeneration is a creation unto good works. The salvation that we are exhorted to work out is sanctification, and even in sanctification the prevenient grace of God works in us, both to will the work and to do it. All the exhortations in this letter are towards sanctification, a cultivating and developing of the Christian life.

There are several special points in the exhortation, 2:12-18:

1. "Don't depend on Paul—he is absent—you, yourselves, work out *your own* salvation. It is your salvation, not his."

2. "Depend on God—He is always present to enable you both to will and to perform."

3. The manner of the obedience is "without murmurings and questionings," an evident allusion to Israel's misconduct in the wilderness, more elaborately treated in I Cor. 10.

4. The end of the working out: (a) As to themselves was blameless—harmless—without blemish. See Eph. 5:27 and I Thess. 5:23. (b) *As to the world* was that they might be seen as lights, holding forth the Word of Life. (c) *As to Paul* was that he might have whereof to glory in the day of Christ, proving that he had not run in vain nor labored in vain. (d) As to both Paul and themselves, in case he suffered martyrdom at that time was that he would be a libation poured out on the sacrifice and service of their faith, to their mutual joy.

On this reference to the drink offering, which was the liquid part, *i. e.*, the wine, of the meal offering, observe:

1. It was not itself a bloody or an atoning sacrifice, but an act of worship following propitiation, expressive of dependence on the divine favor for all the blessings of temporal prosperity and of appreciation thereof.

2. A part of the offering was burned with incense, the incense representing their prayers to or worship of God,

the burning representing God's acceptance of their sacrifice, but the wine was poured on or around the altar (See first recorded instance of the drink offering poured *on* the altar, Gen. 35:14).

3. The Philippian contribution to God, in the person of His apostle, is the New Testament fulfillment of the old typical meal-offering—a spiritual sacrifice of the new régime. See the thought elaborated at the close of the letter: "I am filled, having received from Epaphroditus the things that came from you, an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God," 4:18, 19, and a similar reference in II Cor. 9:10-15.

All this leads to the explanation of the apostle's meaning when he says, "Yea, and if I am *poured out* upon the sacrifice and service of your faith," which means that in case of his martyrdom at that time his blood would represent the outpoured wine, or drink-offering, completing their spiritual meal-offering. The sacrifice would then be a joint one, their part representing the meal, oil and incense, and his part the libation of wine; hence the consequent mutual joy.

I have been thus particular in this explanation to save you from adopting two errors of many commentators, towit:

1. That Paul follows the idea of the heathen sacrifice rather than the idea of the ritual of Old Testament law.

2. That the thought of the passage is that Paul is acting as the priest in presenting the Philippian sacrifice, and while so acting is slain, pouring out his blood on their sacrifices, as Pilate mingled the blood of the Galileans with their sacrifices. Both of these are grave errors and utterly untenable. The New Testament spiritual sacrifices never fulfill heathen types, and particularly in the New Testament economy the kingdom officers are never the priests of the people. Every citizen of Christ's kingdom is a priest unto God, and without a human "go-between" directly offers

to God his own spiritual sacrifices through Jesus Christ himself, the only mediator between God and man.

It is one of the deadliest errors of the Papacy that Christians require a human priest to mediate their offerings. Neither apostle, pastor, evangelist or any of the saints, or the Virgin Mary, exercise such functions. It is blasphemy against Christ and subversive of the priesthood of each individual saint. The New Testament knocks out the middle-man. We want not the shadow of a human priest to fall on our cradle, our absolution, our Bible, our marriages, our Christian offerings, our observance of the Lord's supper, our death, the sepulture of our bones, our disembodied souls.

There can be no more beautiful thought than Paul's conception; his pouring out the wine of life was his *libation.* What he speaks of here as only a possibility, he later, at the end of his second imprisonment, speaks of as a certainty, yea, already taking place: "I am already being poured out, and the time of my exodus is come," II Tim. 4:6. Ah! what a libation!

Here we recall the words of Tom Moore in "Paradise and Peri:"

> "Oh! if there be one boon, one offering,
> That Heaven holds dear,
> 'Tis the last libation that Liberty draws
> From the heart that bleeds and breaks in her cause."

But the drop of patriot blood did not open the gates of Paradise to the exiled Peri. The libation of Christian martyrdom far outranks the libation of a dying patriot, but Paradise must already be opened by holier and atoning blood before either can be acceptable to God as a Christian sacrifice.

Epaphroditus—Timothy—Paul. "I have sent Epaphroditus," "I send Timothy forthwith," "I trust in the Lord that I, myself, shall come shortly." How deep his concern

for these Philippians, and how tenderly sympathetic his heart toward them in all their anxieties, their sufferings and spiritual needs! How appreciative of the merits of his co-laborers, and how complete his testimony to their fidelity! No wonder the brightest and most gifted young preachers delighted to serve under his leadership.

We may count it a settled thing that no man can be a great leader of men who has no power to draw a following. And no man can long hold the following he draws whose selfishness does not allow him to recognize and appreciate the merits of his followers. He must testify to the value of their service, not in the insincere compliments of a politician, but in the spontaneous expressions of truth and love. It is Paul's testimony that paints in fadeless word-colors the portraits of Timothy and Epaphroditus, and confers immortality on them by hanging their portraits in the gallery of Christian heroes, ever seen as if living, and held in everlasting remembrance. So as stars in the constellation of Paul, they shine forever.

The third chapter of Philippians, rightly commencing with verse 2, is every way remarkable. Its solemn, urgent caution is not called out by any condition already existing at Philippi, but an anticipated condition. There were few Jews at Philippi and few Jewish Christians. The apostle knew well, however, the persistence, both of Jewish hostility to the doctrine of the cross, and also the persistence of that element of Jewish converts that with tireless propagandism sought to make Christianity a mere sect of Judaism. He writes as if some disturbing incident at Rome or new message brought from abroad had interrupted his letter, indicating an imminent danger to the faith of the Philippians, and hence the abruptness of his change of topic: "Beware of the dogs, beware of the evil workers, beware of the concision."

It is quite probable that the fires were already kindled

under the Jewish pot—A.D. 62—that would make it boil over in revolution against Roman authority, and precipitate the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. As these fires grew hotter it would be necessary later to write the letter to the Hebrew Christians of Asia that would make a complete and final break between Judaism and Christianity, and that would turn all Jewish Asia against Paul as he so sadly notes in his last letter, II Tim. 1:15.

In a time of intense fanatical patriotism the Letter to the Hebrews, so clearly showing the abrogation of the Jewish polity and the complete supersession of the Old Covenant, would incense all Jews against the writer. Midway between this third chapter to the Philippians and the Letter to the Hebrews would appear Col. 2:8-23, showing progress toward the final break. Paul's prescience discerned the signs of the times, and the desperate intolerance that would be awakened in the misled patriot party of Jews. On this account we have Paul's admonition.

There is here, as elsewhere, a play on the words, "dogs," "workers" and "concision." The Pharisees counted Gentiles as dogs and stressed ritualistic observance and external works and fleshly circumcision as a means to salvation, indeed counted themselves as free, never in bondage, because of lineal descent from Abraham and of the circumcision. Paul retorts: "They are the real dogs; their works are evil and unavailing; their circumcision is a mere mutilation of the flesh." Regeneration is the spiritual circumcision and the source of good works. The issue was vital and fundamental, as announced by our Lord to Nicodemus, viz.:

THE FLESH VS. THE SPIRIT

Paul illustrates by his own example. He was of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, circumcised the eighth day (therefore not a proselyte), a Hebrew of the Hebrews,

of the sect of the Pharisees, touching the law blameless, zealous to persecution, so if any man might have confidence in the flesh, he more. But all these things he counted as refuse in comparison with the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, through whom comes the true righteousness grasped by simple faith. So far the passage is in line with Galatians and Romans on justification by faith, apart from natural birth and works of the law. He then passes on like Romans 8 to sanctification, and like I Cor. 15 to glorification.

Commencing with "That I may gain [or win] Christ"—last clause of 3:8 to the end of 3:14—is the remarkable part of the chapter which calls for special explanation. Adopting the logical rather than the consecutive order of the words we notice first:

THE HIGH CALLING, OR VOCATION

Paul's calling (Acts 9:3-6; 22:6-10; 26:12-19) was special and effectual. It was a high calling, not only as coming from on high, but because it was toward high things of both duty and glory. It was a calling of God in Christ Jesus. Like a foot-race, it had a goal where the judge awarded a prize. The race is not run until the goal is reached, nor won until the prize is awarded.

What, then, is the goal? It is the state of the resurrection from the dead, and includes both complete sanctification of the spirit and glorification of the body. Paul had not yet attained either one. What is the prize? It is that which is to be won: "That I may win, or gain, Christ, and he found in Him at the great judgment day." Here the "winning of Christ," or the prize, is not merely justification by faith, when one first believes, but getting to Him where He now is, and being completely like Him in both soul and body. It is that state in which the final judgment finds us. "Attaining unto the resurrection from the dead" means attaining to the state of the resurrection from the dead,

and not merely the act of being raised. It is quite important that we know when the salvation of the soul is complete, and when sanctification of the soul is perfected. It is only the other side of death that the "spirits of the just made perfect" are seen. (Hebrews 12:22-24.)

As long as life has a lesson to be learned, or a discipline to be endured, the race of the soul is not run, nor the goal reached. By one fact we positively know when the soul-discipline is ended. It is precisely at that time when it is passing over the line where accountability to judgment ceases. And the final judgment takes cognizance of the deeds done in the body.

No soul, good or bad, is judged on account of what it does after the death of the body, but it is judged for all deeds up to that event.

Therefore the goal for the soul is the death of the body, and the goal for the body is its resurrection. If it be raised in dishonor, the prize is lost. If it be raised in honor, glorified like the body of our Lord, the prize is won.

You can thus understand Paul's words: "Not that I have already obtained, or am already made perfect." He had "not yet laid hold on all the things for which Christ laid hold of him." When Christ apprehended Saul of Tarsus on the way to Damascus, He laid hold of him for more things than Paul had yet laid hold of. Paul wanted more than had yet been realized. He was indeed already justified and regenerated, and had already made much progress, but much was yet ahead. The race was not yet run over the whole course; the goal and the prize were yet to be reached and won. Later, indeed, when actually facing martyrdom he wrote: "I am already being poured out, and the time of my exodus is come. I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith: *henceforth* [not sooner] there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give to me at that day; and

not to me only [to show that the goal is the same with all the runners] but to all them that have loved His appearing," II Tim. 4:6-8.

This is in line with what he wrote to the Thessalonians: "And the Lord of peace himself shall sanctify you wholly [not in part]; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, I Thess. 5:23.

Those who claim to be sinless now, to have already attained perfection of spirit, only advertise their guilty distance from God and put themselves into an attitude of direct conflict with the scriptures.

See I Kings 8:36; I John 1:8. Making such a claim in this life shows that the one making it is in a dim light. Light makes manifest. Job, apart from God and confronted by man only, maintained his integrity, but when Jehovah came in the whirlwind Job said,

"Who is this that hideth counsel without knowledge?
Therefore have I uttered that which I understood not,
Things too wonderful for me, which I knew not.
Hear, I beseech thee, and I will speak;
I will demand of thee, and declare thou unto me.
I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear;
But now mine eye seeth thee:
Wherefore I abhor myself,
And repent in dust and ashes," Job 42:3-6.

Isaiah was the saintliest man of his generation, but in the year that King Uzziah died he saw the Lord of hosts in the supernal light of heaven, and heard the Cherubim crying, "Holy, Holy, Holy, is Jehovah of hosts," then he said, "Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, Jehovah of hosts."

If, then, Paul had not yet attained and counted not himself already perfect what does he do? (1) Forgetting the things behind, (2) stretching out to the things before, (3) he presses on toward the goal.

The meaning of these words needs to be brought out in a realistic way. We forget a defeat in the past when we do not stay whipped in mind, but courageously try another battle, like Robert Bruce, who failed twelve times and then won the thirteenth time, at Bannockburn. We forget past victories when we do not rest on our laurels but "count nothing done while anything remains to be done." General Gates rested on the laurels of Saratoga and found defeat at Camden. He fled at the beginning of the battle, ran eighty miles to Charlottesville, and if he had not died he would be running yet.

Dr. Burleson used to tell of a man who related such a brilliant experience to the church when he joined it that it evoked unusual praise from pastor and church. So much was said about it that he, himself, began to glory in it. He carefully wrote it out and would read it to every visitor. He became so complacent over it that he stopped right there—no progress—a case of arrested development. In the lapse of time the mice got into the drawer where he kept his precious document and ate up his Christian experience! We need an experience that rats cannot eat up—an experience not folded up and put in a drawer, but one that moves forward taking "the steps of the faith of Abraham."

QUESTIONS

1. State the terminal points of this great exhortation, and its rank.
2. Show that exhortation is a distinct gift of the Spirit, and distinguish between exhortation and teaching.
3. Cite the names of some early Texas Baptist preachers or deacons who were great in exhortation, and the effect on both Christians and sinners.
4. What mistakes may be made as to exhortation, and what is the real lightning of exhortation?
5. To what class, saints or sinners, is this whole exhortation addressed, and to what particular duty does all the exhortation in this letter point?
6. Cite three special points in the exhortation, and the four ends in view.

7. Between what phases of salvation does this letter clearly distinguish?
8. What three important observations on Paul's allusion to the drink offering in his possible libation?
9. What the exact meaning of his being "poured out" on the sacrifice of their faith and service?
10. What two grave errors of interpretation by some commentators on this passage, and what the fearful consequences of the second?
11. Show that what is here spoken of as a possible libation is later spoken of as a certainty.
12. Cite the illustrative passage in Tom Moore's "Paradise and the Peri," and what is a greater libation and why either cannot open the gates of Paradise, giving two proofs from the revised text of Revelation, which tells of Paradise regained?
13. In the references to Timothy and Epaphroditus, what great excellencies of heart does Paul exhibit, and how do these immortalize both of them?
14. Where should the third chapter commence, and what probably calls forth this abrupt change in the direction of the exhortation, and how probably this also called forth Col. 2:8-23 and still later the Letter to the Hebrews?
15. How may this Letter to the Hebrews have occasioned the "turning away of all Asia" from Paul, referred to in II Tim. 1:15?
16. Show the play on words in "Beware of the dogs, beware of the evil workers, beware of the concision."
17. What the antitype of circumcision, what the real issue here involved, and what its importance?
18. How does Paul illustrate the case?
19. Where in his ilustrative example does the reference to justification by faith end, and where commences and ends the reference to sanctification of soul and glorification of body?
20. Explain the "high calling."
21. What athletic game is used to illustrate?
22. What the "goal" for the spirit, and how do you prove it?
23. What the "goal" of the body?
24. Show that this does not make death a purifier.
25. If one makes claim of perfection of spirit now, what two things does it prove, and illustrate by two Old Testament examples?
26. Not having yet obtained, show what three things Paul does, and explain and illustrate the terms.
27. Relate Dr. Burleson's illustration.

XXVII

THE MINISTRY OF TEARS AND PAUL'S RECIPE FOR HAPPINESS

Scripture: Phil. 3:15—4:23

THIS chapter closes the exposition of the letter to the Philippians. Commencing at 3:15 we make a running comment on the rest of the letter.

"Let us therefore, as many as are perfect." It is somewhat surprising that just before this Paul said that he counted not himself to be perfect, but that is in the passive voice, to be perfected. Now we have an active form of the same word, only it is an adjective instead of a verb, and the question arises, Is there a contradiction? The answer is, no. The adjective, "perfect," is frequently used in the New Testament in the sense of full-grown, mature, as a mature Christian and not a novice, not a babe in Christ, as in the Letter to the Hebrews, where he says that "when for the time ye ought to be teachers ye have need that one teach you again the first principles of the oracles of God," and then says, "Let us go on to perfection," that is, to maturity.

To continue: "And if in anything ye are otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you." What kind of a revelation is this? Does it mean that God will indefinitely keep up His external revelation, so that there will be continual additions to the Bible? It does not mean that. It is an internal revelation by the Spirit of God. In other words, where a matter is not clear to a man, if he be of the right

mind and seeks the Spirit's guidance, then God will reveal the matter to him by inward monition.

Verse 17: "Brethren, be ye imitators together of me, and mark them that so walk even as ye have us for an ensample. For many walk, of whom I told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: whose end is perdition, whose God is the belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things."

This passage puts before us two examples, one they are exhorted to follow, and the other they are exhorted to shun. The first is the example of Paul himself just cited and expounded in the preceding chapter. Every preacher should be an example to the flock, as Peter says: "Not lords over God's heritage, but examples to the flock." Now Paul wishes to be imitated just as far as he follows Christ, as he explains it in another passage, "Follow me as I follow Christ." The other, the evil example, and before I expound it I raise this question: To what kind of people is he referring that give this evil example? Then I raise this question: Is he referring to the Judaizing element of the Christian church, as he has been doing in chapter 3? He is referring to Antinomians, whether Jews or Gentiles. That is a big word and is applied in theology to that class of people who emphasize salvation through justification so as to deny the necessity of Christian people living right, that is, opposed to the law. I do not know any worse enemies to the cross of Christ than the Antinomians, and I am sorry to say that we have had some of them in Texas. They are not necessarily Jews, but people who, as Luther did in some things, so stress justification by faith, election, calling and predestination that they take no account of the kind of life that a Christian ought to live. I am ashamed to say that I knew a Baptist preacher in Texas who, after offering an infamous proposition to a fellow Christian—too

shameful for me to specify—said, "What harm will it do? You and I are both Christians, and nothing that a Christian does is charged against him."

Paul says, "I tell you, even weeping, that these people are enemies of the cross of Christ. Their god is their appetite—their lust; their god is the gratification of their animal desires, and they glory in their shame." To me the most horrible thing in the world is for a man to profess belief in the high doctrines of grace and then live an evil life. God calls men to good works; God regenerates men, creates them unto good works, and whom He calls He not only justifies but sanctifies, and I am sure that the unsanctified man will never enter heaven.

I quote a part of that verse again: "I now tell you, even weeping." Such a thing excited the deepest concern in Paul's heart, and I recall attention to this verse in order to cite in this connection Monod's lectures, or sermons on Paul, and particularly the one on the "Tears of Paul." What things excited this man's tears? There are many cases of Paul's weeping, and in each case there was a specific cause for his tears.

Let us look at Jesus on Olivet weeping over Jerusalem. There is no such lamentation in all history: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate!" On this passage is based the hymn—

> "Did Christ o'er sinners weep?
> And shall our cheeks be dry?
> Let floods of penitential grief,
> Burst forth from every eye."

The Psalm says, "He that goeth forth weeping, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing,

bringing his sheaves with him." Tears are an indication of earnestness and sympathy. Macaulay, in that famous poem of his, "The Battle of Ivry," represents Henry of Navarre this way:

> "He looked upon the foemen and his glance was stern and high;
> He looked upon his comrades and a tear was in his eye."

Verse 20: "For our citizenship is in heaven." The citizens of a city were enrolled. Rome enrolled her citizens, and the Philippians were all on that roll as being a Roman colony, but our citizenship is in the New Jerusalem, the heavenly Jerusalem, from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ. Where is Jesus now? He is in heaven, at the right hand of the Father. How long will He remain there? Until His enemies be made His footstool. Why will He come back to this earth? To raise the dead, the just and the unjust, and to judge the world in righteousness. Our citizenship is in heaven. From whence, *i. e.,* from heaven; Peter says, "Whom the heavens must retain until the time of the restoration of all things," and our text adds, "Who shall change our vile bodies that they may be fashioned like unto His glorious body according to the working whereby He is able to subdue all things unto himself." That subject is abundantly discussed in I Cor. 15, and it embodies a cardinal doctrine, vital and fundamental. A man who does not believe in the resurrection of the dead and the glorification of the bodies of the saints, has no right to claim to be a Christian.

Keble in his "Christian Year" uses this language:

> "Before the judgment seat,
> Though changed and glorified each face,
> Not unremembered we shall meet,
> For endless ages to embrace."

Chapter 4: "Therefore, my brethren beloved and longed for, my joy and crown." More than once I have called

attention to Paul's joy and crown. He says about the same thing in the letter to the Thessalonians—"Ye are my crown of rejoicing." The Psalmist says, "He shall come again with rejoicing, bringing His sheaves with Him."

When we enter heaven it will not delight us that on earth we were great generals, or great admirals, or great statesmen, but it will delight us to see there those who, through our instrumentality, were saved. That shares the very heart of Christ.

"He will be wondered at" in the old sense of the word admired in all them that believe, and the whole ransomed church of God will be His crown of rejoicing. "He shall see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied." So when we see those of them whom we have influenced to become Christians, or more faithful Christians, they will be our "crown of rejoicing."

When Spurgeon died a memorial service of his death was held in Nashville, Tennessee, and I was invited to deliver the oration; and in my first volume of sermons is that oration. As a part of the oration I drew a picture, and yet a scriptural picture, of those who greeted Spurgeon when he entered heaven—the aged widows whom he had sheltered and protected, the orphans whom he had clothed and fed, the young preachers whom he had instructed and whose expenses he had largely met and who were supplied with libraries by his wife—these all, passing into heaven, were standing on the battlements to shout their welcome to the coming preacher, and he shouted back, "Ye are my crown of rejoicing," and it is this to which Paul alludes when he says, "For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. But if any man buildeth on the foundation gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay, stubble; * * * a day of fire shall declare it," and the bad material that he has put on shall be his loss. He, himself, who is on the foundation will be saved, but only the good material that he has put in the building will be

his reward. "He will come with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him."

We now come to an exhortation upon which I wish to give a few remarks. "I exhort Euodia, and I exhort Syntyche, to be of the same mind in the Lord. Yea, I beseech thee also, true yokefellow, help these women, for they labored with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and the rest of my fellow-workers, whose names are in the book of life."

The position of women in Macedonia was far superior to many other countries, and the Macedonian women were particularly prominent and useful in the Philippian church. That, in fact, accounted in part for the great liberality of that church. Here were two sisters, both prominent, both great workers, that helped Paul when he was there, and also Clement, and they helped all the rest of Paul's fellow-workers. But they fell apart, I do not know just why. There might have been some little talk at a quilting, but I am pretty sure it was not at a bridge party. Or it might have been at a Ladies' Aid Society. How sad! Paul stands up for these women. He gives them both a certificate of good character; they were both noble workers, his fellow-laborers. He exhorts somebody, whoever this true yokefellow is, to help these women to get together. It is a very sad thing when two prominent men in a church get to pulling apart, but I think it is a sadder thing when two prominent women get to pulling apart. Men know better how to put things in a parenthesis than women. Whenever there is a sharp difference between two women in a church it is much more apt to reach the home and the children. A man can have a difference with a man and say nothing to the wife about it, and especially to the children, but if a woman has a difficulty everybody in the house has to hear about it, and everybody must take sides or get into trouble.

I am a great believer in women's societies. A woman's society helped to take care of our Lord. There are a great many Texas churches that would have gone into oblivion long ago but for a few faithful women. They were the life and soul of this Philippian church.

It is too bad that Euodia and Syntyche could not pull together. The longer we serve as pastors the more we find Euodias and Syntyches, and the Lord give us wisdom when we come to deal with these cases. "I beseech thee also, true yokefellow, help those women."

Let us look at this word, "yokefellow." Is it a proper name or not? Farrer and others say that this is a proper noun, and by a play on words, not unusual with Paul, he calls him a true yokefellow. I think Paul refers to Epaphroditus, who was there when this letter arrived and who was the pastor, and he had just demonstrated at Rome that he was a true yokefellow with Paul. The subscription says that this letter was carried by Epaphroditus. Paul could refer to the pastor of the church as the yokefellow, who put his neck into the yoke when he found Paul in prison at Rome, and helped him pull the gospel wagon; so I doubt its being a proper noun.

Verse 3 closes this way: "Whose names are in the book of life." On that book of life I give some scriptures to be studied: Exodus 32:32, 33; Psalm 69:28 and 87:6; Isaiah 4:3; Ezekiel 13:9; Daniel 12:1; Luke 10:20, and the following passages in Revelation: 3:5; 13:8; 17:8; 20:12; 21:27, and I also recommend that one of my sermons in the first book of sermons called "The Library of Heaven." The last book mentioned as belonging to the "Library of Heaven" is the book of life, and in that sermon will be found some helpful light on this book of life, and particularly on this question: When does a man's name go into the book of life? Of course in the divine purpose the roll of the saved was complete in eternity. He who

hath numbered the very hairs of our heads I presume has numbered the heads as well, and in that sense the book would be the elect as in God's thought, but I don't think that is the thought here. The book of life is the register of the citizens enrolled. He says, "Our citizenship is in heaven." Our names go down and we become citizens, that is, whenever we are converted. It is a register of judicial decisions recorded as each one is justified. Hence this book is the deciding thing at the judgment seat of Christ: "Whosoever is not found written in the book of life"—already written before the judgment day comes—"shall be cast into the lake of fire." It is in view of that book that we have that good old Baptist hymn:

> "When thou, my righteoeus Judge, shalt come,
> To take thy ransomed people home,
> Shall I among them stand?
> Shall I, who sometimes am afraid to die,
> Be found at thy right hand?
> How can I bear the piercing thought:
> What if my name should be left out?"

In verse 5, going on with the running comment, we have this statement, "The Lord is at hand." What does that mean? It does not mean the Lord's coming. It means His presence. It means that we should live continually as if sensible of the presence of the Lord right here. As John says in the letter to the Laodiceans, "Behold I stand at the door and knock"—at the door of the heart of the church member—"and if any man hear my voice and open the door I will come in and I will sup with him and he will sup with me."

Commencing with verse 6 and extending to verse 9 we have the famous recipe for happiness as found in the analysis. Here is the secret of happiness, and it certainly consists of the following things:

1. *"Be anxious about nothing."* We have heard people say, "It is the pace that kills." It is not the *pace* that kills;

it is the *anxiety* that kills—the anxiety that draws the wrinkles on the brow and the crow's feet around the eyes, and makes a man look as if he was not only aged, but burdened—an Atlas with the world on his shoulders, and those anxieties are the *kill-joys* and the most foolish things in the world, for nine-tenths of the things that we are anxious about never happen. The danger exists in our imagination. "A brave man never dies but once—a coward is dying all the time. He dies every day of his life."

My father taught his children a solemn lesson. He had *only* twelve children of his own, so he adopted three other families, making twenty-five in all, and in the winter time the great room of our house was the dining-room, about forty feet long, and a fire-place eight feet wide. It took two grown men to bring in the back log for us. Now, with that big fire-place roaring and the big, heavy dining-table pushed back, the twenty-five of us would gather around that fire and he would talk and instruct us. One day—I shall never forget it—it was Saturday—the dining-table had just been pushed back and every boy on the place was growling because they had planned to go fishing and it was pouring down rain. My father looked around and said, "Boys, by the will of God, I give you permission to fret and be anxious about everything in the world but two things." We thought this allowed us a big margin and eagerly asked what they were. This was his answer:

"First, never fret or be anxious about a thing you can help. If you can help it, just help it, and quit worrying.

"Second, never fret about a thing you can't help, for fretting won't do any good."

The more we thought about it the more we found that there wasn't any margin about it at all; the two things covered all things.

In Psalm 37 is a passage that I have read at family prayers oftener than any other in the Bible, another recipe

for happiness: "Fret not yourselves because of evil doers * * * Trust in the Lord and do good * * * Delight thyself also in the Lord, and He shall bring it to pass. Rest in the Lord; wait patiently for Him. * * * I have seen the wicked in great power, spreading himself like a green bay tree; and lo! he passed away. * * * I have never seen the righteous forsaken nor his seeding begging bread. * * * The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord." To the same effect is our Savior's Sermon on the Mount: "Be not anxious for the morrow, as to what ye shall eat or drink, or what ye shall put on." That is the first step in the recipe for happiness. Throw anxieties over your shoulders. They don't do a bit of good.

It was a custom in that big family of ours to practice archery. It was noticeable that whenever a boy drew an arrow to the head and let it fly at the target, if the arrow, visible in its flight, seemed to be going too far to the right he would lean to the left, as if his leaning would shape the course of a shaft after it was sped from the bow. So in futile anxiety we waste our strength on impossible things.

2. "But in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God." When we are troubled about anything let us take it to the Lord in prayer. *We* can't carry it. Let us put it on Him. That is the second step. What is the result? "And the peace of God which passeth all understanding shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." The peace of God!

3. The first step disposes of anxiety, and the second substitutes prayers and supplication with thanksgiving. The third element of the recipe relates to the government of the thoughts: "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honorable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there

be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things."

I call attention to a law. *We become assimilated, that is, made like unto the things that we habitually and steadfastly contemplate.* If we habitually think about falsehood, and dishonesty, and murder, and unlawful things, and things of bad report, and immodest things, then we become like them.

A lady member of my church had great concern about the future of her daughter. I said to her, "My sister, what sort of pictures do you hang up in your daughter's room to look at the first thing in the morning and the last thing at night? If you want her to be unselfish, put up the picture of Florence Nightingale or Clara Barton. If you want her to be modest or pure in heart, put up the picture of Mrs. Prentiss. If you want her to be worldly-minded, then put up those fashionable pictures that represent worldly things, like a round of fashionable social games and pleasures, as the thing for her to think about."

While I am talking about pictures I am not referring so much to painted canvas as to the direction of habitual thoughts. It is a tremendous lesson.

God pity the poor girl whose selfish, worldly-minded mother is thinking only of society's demands and leaves the girl's soul beggarly and bankrupt in the sight of God.

Dr. Broadus used to say, "The best way to judge a man is to ask him to tell what he reads when he is tired. On what does he relax his mind." Some people want to go to a show, some to read yellow-back literature, some to take a moral furlough. Our habitual trend is evidenced by what our minds turn to as soon as restraint of duty is removed. What comes to us first—say, on Monday morning after we have preached on Sunday—on what the preachers call "Blue Monday?"

4. The fourth element of the recipe for happiness is in

the verses 11, 12, 13: "I have learned in whatsoever state I am, therein to be content. I know how to be abased, and I know how to abound: in everything and in all things have I learned the secret both to be filled and to be hungry, both to abound and to be in want. I can do all things in Him that strengtheneth me." Of course that man is unhappy whose happiness depends on a big dinner, and he can't get it, or upon the weather; he is miserable because it rains or is cold, or if the bank breaks and the crop fails. Here I give a secret that I told all over Texas in 1887: *The springs of our happiness are never outside of us but in us.* If we are all right inside, the external things can't disturb our happiness. The remarkable, acute discernment of Robert Burns expresses the thought exactly:

"'Tis no' in title, nor in rank,
'Tis no' in wealth like Lundon bank,
To give us peace and rest;
If happiness has not her seat
And center in the breast;
We may be wise, or rich, or great,
But never can be blest."

I have already discussed the offerings that Paul next refers to, and so I come to the conclusion of the letter: "Salute every saint in Christ Jesus." But suppose a man is a Methodist! Well, if he be a saint, salute him. If he be a Roman Catholic, give him the hand of fellowship—not the hand of church fellowship—but Christian fellowship; rejoice in heart over every really converted soul of whatever denomination.

"They that are of Cæsar's household salute you." What was Cæsar's household? It does not mean Cæsar's individual family, but his slaves and dependents. The household of a Roman Emperor included clients and advisers, as well as hundreds of slaves, well-trained, efficient, educated, and many of them nobles in their own land before their captivity. Some of the noblest men and women in

Rome were slaves who had been princes and princesses in their own land; some of them had been heroes. Cæsar's household was very extensive. Dr. Lightfoot calls attention to the fact that a recent discovery bears on this passage. He says that the names of 170 members of Cæsar's household are inscribed on the monuments that have been discovered, and they include quite a number of names mentioned in Paul's Letter to the Romans.

QUESTIONS

1. What the sense of "perfect" in 3:15, and what its distinction from "perfected" in 3:12?
2. What the sense of "reveal" in 3:15?
3. What two examples, one good and the other bad, are put before us in 3:17, 18, and who are these "enemies of the cross?"
4. Cite the instances of Paul's weeping, showing for what in each case, and cite every instance of our Lord's weeping and for what in each case, together with a pertinent passage from the Psalms concerning the same, and the cases of Elisha and Jeremiah, all bearing on the ministry of tears.
5. Who has given a great discourse on the tears of Paul?
6. Cite the first stanza of the hymn on the weeping of Christ, and Macaulay's couplet on Henry of Navarre in the battle of Ivry.
7. What the allusion in "Our citizenship is in heaven," and what the parallel passage in Ephesians?
8. On the "whence also we wait for our Lord," verse 20, cite a passage from the Psalms and one from Peter in Acts, showing how long our Lord remains in heaven, and a pertinent passage each from Romans and I Corinthians to show what his employment is in heaven.
9. What Paul's "crown of rejoicing" in 4:1, and our Lord's at the judgment?
10. Why is an alienation between two prominent good women of a church more disastrous and more difficult to heal than in the case of men?
11. Who the yokefellow in 4:2, and does the reference to Clement mean that he, with the women, labored with Paul, or that these women labored with Clement and others as well as Paul?
12. Cite the passages in both Testaments on the "book of life," tell what it is, when the enrollment takes place, and what its final use.
13. Cite a stanza from a great hymn bearing on this final use.
14. What the meaning of "The Lord is at hand," and cite a similar passage from James and one from Revelation.
15. State the four elements of the recipe for happiness in 4:6-8, 11-13, and give parallel to same, part in Psalms and part in the Sermon on the Mount.
16. What the meaning of Cæsar's household?

THE BOOK OF PHILEMON

XXVIII

Scripture: Phile. 1-25

THIS letter was addressed to Philemon, Apphia, Archippus, and the church in Philemon's house. The probable relations of these parties to each other are as follows: Philemon the husband, Apphia the wife, Archippus the son. Philemon was probably pastor of the church in his own house, and Archippus probably pastor of the church at Colosse, or possibly at Hierapolis. This letter was principally addressed to Philemon because he, alone, under the law, had full control over Onesimus for life or death, and his decision was final. The family and the church in his house were included because the status of Onesimus, when determined by Philemon, would necessarily interest and affect them all.

The relation of Paul to Philemon prior to this letter is given in verse 19, in which Paul says, "Thou owest to me even thine own self," which implies that he was Paul's convert. This conversion probably occurred in Paul's two years' meeting at Ephesus when "All they that dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks," Acts 19:10.

The inhabitants of the Lycus valley were doubtless accustomed to attend the May Festivals at Ephesus in honor of Diana "whom all Asia worshiped," Acts 19:27. Paul's meeting overlapped two of these festivities. Paul also calls Philemon his "beloved and fellow-worker," verse 1, and his

"partner," verse 17. The terms seem to imply that Philemon was a preacher. Moreover, Paul heard reports by Epaphras of Philemon's faith and work, verses 5-7.

Paul's previous relation to Archippus is seen from the following statements: He calls him "fellow-soldier," verse 2, and in the accompanying letter to the Colossians, 4:17, he sends this message: "Say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfill it." So it is probable that Archippus also was a convert of Paul and ordained by him.

Doubtless his family lived at Colosse (Compare verses 2, 11, 12, 16 with Col. 1:2; 4:9, 17) and other letters were sent at the same time with this, viz.: Colossians and Ephesians (Compare Philemon 10, 13; Col. 4:7, 9; Eph. 6:21), the date of which is about A.D. 63.

The characteristics of the Letter to Philemon are, (a) It it one of the shortest in the New Testament. (b) It is more personal than any other except perhaps II John. III John, though personal also, has more to say of missionary and church matters. (c) It is about a private matter over which Philemon has absolute legal control.

This brief personal letter about a private matter is of immense importance, and therefore was incorporated into the inspired Bible. That private matter touches the world-wide institution of slavery—an institution as old as human history—and discloses the attitude of Christianity toward the institution. But there are other Pauline passages which also disclose Christianity's attitude toward slavery. Paul himself in Gal. 3:27, 28 declares, "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. In Christ Jesus there can be *neither bond nor free.*" And in I Cor. 12:13 he declares: "In one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether bond or free," and in Col. 3:11 he declares: "In the new man there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman,

freeman; but Christ is all and in all." These are great principles.

These passages teach (1) In Christ there can be no distinction between bond and free. (2) In water-baptism there can be none. (3) In the Spirit-baptism there can be none. (4) In the church there can be none. These settle the attitude of Christianity toward slavery so far as principles go. Moreover, in Col. 3:22—4:1; Eph. 6:5-9; I Tim. 6:1, 2; Tit. 2:9, 10 he sets forth with great clearness the reciprocal duties of the Christian master and slave. These passages settle Christianity's attitude toward slavery so far as duties go. But in both principles and duties the discussion is abstract. The peculiar value of Philemon is that it gives us a concrete case, all the parties involved not only being prominent and well known, but all belonging to one household and to one church. The slave is named and his offense. The master, his wife, his son and his church are named. An inspired apostle comes in contact with the fugitive slave. Not then in abstract generalities as given in the two sets of passages above, but in a most specific and concrete case what will Christianity do? Not what ought it to do, but what did it do? Let us not shun the particulars:

1. It convicted the slave of the double sin of fleeing from the master and of robbing him.

2. It led him to repentance and reformation.

3. It converted him to Christ, thus bringing him into a blessed state of peace with God.

4. It manifested intense sympathy with and love toward this slave as a man equal before God with all other men in religious privileges.

5. It restores the now penitent fugitive slave, with his own consent, to his master, according to the laws of the land, but it identifies the slave with the apostle returning him, who assumes all that the slave owes the master by theft or loss of service.

6. It counts the converted slave as a spiritual son and as the very heart of the sender.

7. It commends him as a brother in Christ to the master, and intercedes for full forgiveness.

8. It assumes not to command that the slave be set free, but suggests it to the master, as of his own free will, in expressing confidence that the Christian master "will do more than is asked." Thus Christianity's attitude toward slavery is expressed in the foregoing principles, reciprocal duties and concrete case. Without the concrete case the Bible would be incomplete.

Let us see how this attitude has been received:

1. Those who comprehend that the kingdom of our Lord is not of this world, but having to do with spiritual matters between God and man and between man and man, and stands opposed to arms and violence as a means of propagation, and that while it claims that we should render unto God all that is God's, and unto Cæsar all that is Cæsar's, are thoroughly satisfied with this attitude and believe that its leavening principles will ultimately abolish slavery and all other legal evils, through the consent of the evil doers converted to God, and that the evil doers not converted to God will be subjected to the punishments of His province and judgment.

2. But fanatics in every age have been dissatisfied with this attitude because it deals only with cases where slave or master is a Christian, and does not commence a crusade against slave-holding *per se,* denouncing and fighting governments and legislation enforcing or permitting slavery, and censure Christianity because it does not resort to violence to enforce its principles. It sneers at an inspired apostle returning a fugitive slave and trusting to voluntary love to bring about his emancipation. For example, these fanatics in this country quit preaching "Christ and Him crucified" and substituted the theme, "John Brown and him hanged."

The result was an emancipation by violence at a cost of blood and treasure that beggars computation, leaving behind problems to be solved that may prove to be insoluble by human wisdom.

Slavery was imposed upon the colonies and later upon the States of this Union as follows:

1. The mother country dumped upon the colonies convicts and political prisoners as slaves.

2. Some of the colonies made slaves of conquered Indians.

3. Men of commerce here and in Europe, through greed, equipped slave ships and introduced African slavery. One New England seaport fitted out a fleet of 250 slave ships, thereby laying the foundation of colossal fortunes which their descendants enjoy to this day.

4. Long after the section into which the slaves were sold earnestly desired the abolition of the slave trade, it was retained in the interest of those enriching themselves by the traffic.

The best men in both free and slave sections regretted its imposition on the nation, but in view of many grave complications were sorely puzzled as to the most honest and practical solution of the problem.

Though born and reared in the South, personally I never knew but one politician who advocated the perpetuity of the slave trade. From my earliest childhood the most familiar talk I can recall was on this line: This institution was imposed upon us. We believe it to be evil, but we recognize difficulties and complications in the solution of the evil calling for the highest human wisdom and forbearance. Its rigors should be abated and gradual emancipation encouraged where provision can be made for the care of those emancipated. Indeed, the first time I ever heard the word, "Abolitionist," it was applied to me, only a child, because I said, "There ought to be no slaves."

In Paul's day slavery as an institution was world-wide and had so existed from the beginning of history. More than half the population of the Roman empire were slaves. The slave had no rights in law. He could be tortured, maimed, crucified, fed to fishes, or thrown to wild beasts at the will of his master. The majority of these slaves were war-captives, equal to their masters in social position and heroism, and oftentimes superior in education and patriotism. This immense servile population formed an ever restless, seething, muttering volcano beneath the fabric of society.

Servile insurrections of magnitude had occurred, threatening to upheave and destroy the foundations of government. Here and there some high-spirited slave—a hero, noble, or prince in his own country—resented, by violence, the indignities heaped upon him by a cruel and capricious master. Hence a law was enacted by Augustus Cæsar that when a master was killed by a slave, all the other slaves of the household should be put to death. Many rich, corrupt Romans had hundreds of slaves. A case in point occurred about the time Paul entered Rome as a prisoner. An infuriated slave, unable in his proud spirit to endure longer the tyranny and cruelty to which he was subjected, slew his Roman master, Pedanius. When it was found that 400 fellow household slaves must now perish, under the law, by wholesale execution, there were popular appeal and protest. But the inexorable Senate decided that public safety demanded the enforcement of the law, and so they sent out a battalion of the Prætorian Guard to repress popular interference and see that the law was enforced. So, surrounded by the imperial guard, the 400 innocent men, women and children were publicly executed.

Roman literature of Paul's day and later teems with allusions to the danger to the State arising from the system of slavery. Historians, poets, and orators grew eloquent

on the dangers toward the State and the masters, but seemed not to realize the horrors of the system toward the slave.

Our Lord had said, "My kingdom is not of this world, else would my servants fight." The mission of Christianity would have perished if it had, as a political, earth-force, preached a crusade against civil institutions and relations. It contented itself by lifting master and slave into a spiritual kingdom where in Christ there would be neither bond nor free, but all were brothers, with equal religious privitian civilization, in whose atmosphere all men become equal, leges and rights. This leaven ultimately creates a Chriseven in civil matters.

One privilege remained to the slave—he might flee to an influential friend of his master and implore his intercession. A case in point is as follows: About thirty years after Paul's letter, a fugitive slave of a rich Roman fled to the noblest Roman of his day, Pliny the younger. Fortunately for literature, Pliny's letter of intercession, when he returned the fugitive slave to his master, has been preserved, furnishing an historical parallel to Paul's letter apart from its religious element.

Following is a translation of Pliny's letter:

"Caius Pliny to Sabinianus, health: Thy freedman, with whom thou saidst thou wast incensed, came to me, and falling at my feet, as if at thine, clung to them. He wept much, much he entreated, and much was the force of his silence. In short, he fully satisfied me of his penitence. Truly I believe him to be reformed, because he is sensible of his wrong. Thou art angry I know; and thou art angry justly, this also I know; but clemency has then the highest praise, when there is the greatest cause for anger. Thou hast loved the man, and I hope thou wilt love him. Meanwhile it is sufficient that thou suffer thyself to be entreated. It will be right for thee to be angry with him again, if he shall deserve it, because having once yielded to entreaty, thine anger will be the more just.

"Forgive something in view of his youth. Forgive on account of his tears. Forgive for the sake of thine own kindness. Do not torture him, lest thou torture also thyself; for thou wilt be in torture, when thou, who art so gentle, shalt be angry. I fear lest, if to his prayers I should unite my own, I should seem not to ask, but to compel. Yet I will unite them, and the more fully and abundantly in that I have very sharply and severely reproved him, strictly threat-

ening that I will never hereafter intercede for him. This I said to him because it was necessary to alarm him; but I do not say the same to thee. For perchance I shall intercede again, and shall again obtain; only that my request be such as it befits me to ask and thee to grant. Farewell."

The letter of the noble heathen does him great credit, not only as an epistolary gem, exquisite in tact and style, but shows his kindliness of heart toward an unfortunate man shut off by law from human right or privilege. But it does not recognize the inherent manhood of a slave. It makes no plea on that score. There is condescending pity in it, but no appeal to God's fatherhood or man's brotherhood. It sees no place in time or eternity where master and slave, on a footing of equality, stand without distinction of person or social position before a supreme and final judge. It does not commend the slave as Pliny's son, or very heart, or as a brother beloved to Sabinianus. It does not offer to make good whatever debt the slave, under the law, may owe to the master. As the heavenly kingdom is higher than the Roman empire, so far does Paul's letter surpass the letter of the noble heathen.

For other purposes than illustration and comparison this letter of Piny is here introduced. It brings to the fore these questions:

1. Did Onesimus, like the slave of Sabinianus, designedly flee to Rome to invoke the intercession of Paul as an influential friend of his master, Philemon?

2. Had there been opportunity to Onesimus to sufficiently know Paul and his relation to Philemon as a warrant for this step?

3. Was Paul, before this letter, ever in the Lycus valley, thus affording the opportunity of this knowledge to Onesimus?

The answers to these questions in order are as follows:

1. In the absence of any statement from Paul as to how he first met Onesimus in Rome, we may for the present

say only this much: It is possible that Onesimus designedly fled to Rome to seek Paul's intercession with his master, and hence that Onesimus himself brought about the first meeting with the apostle for this very purpose.

2. It is every way probable that Onesimus had ample opportunity to sufficiently know Paul and his influential relations with Philemon to warrant the step. This knowledge may have come about in either of two ways: Philemon, in his visits to Ephesus, the metropolis of his province, either while a heathen attending the annual festival in honor of Diana, or after his conversion in attending Paul's meeting, may have followed a common custom not only in taking his wife and son, but his household slaves. In this way Onesimus could have known Paul. Again, a household slave must have heard much of the great apostle, who was not only revolutionizing all Asia, but especially had revolutionized this family, husband, wife, and son, and had led to Christ Epaphras, the evangelist, who had planted the churches in the Lycus valley. In the same way he must have known that Epaphras had gone to Rome to see Paul, a prisoner there.

Thus the opportunity for knowledge was ample. And when we consider the fact that after Onesimus reached Rome, knowing Paul was there, it would be natural for a fugitive slave, anxious to escape detection, to avoid meeting one so well acquainted with his master's family, and it would be quite easy to avoid the meeting, since Paul was hindered from moving about by his chain, and his place of confinement as a prisoner would be well known, unless the slave himself designedly brought about the meeting. Then our answer to the previous question must be changed from "possible" to "probable," for this furnished an adequate reason for the interview, which otherwise the slave had both reason and ability to prevent.

3. The third question, towit: Was Paul ever, before

this letter, in the Lycus valley, thereby increasing the opportunity of Onesimus to know him? We must divide the question, settling first: Was Paul ever before in the Lycus valley? Some contend that he was, because Acts 16:6 says, "He went through the region of Phrygia and Galatia," and the Lycus valley was a part of Phrygia. They fail to note, however, that all of ancient Phrygia was not incorporated into the Roman province of Asia, and that the following verse distinctly declares that he was forbidden by the Holy Spirit to speak the word in Asia at this time.

But Professor Ramsay, an expert on Paul's travels, contending against Bishop Lightfoot, argues with great force that Paul on his third tour must have passed through the Lycus valley to reach Ephesus. The scriptures on which he bases his contention are Acts 18:23 and 19:1, which say, "He went through the region of Galatia, and Phrygia, in order, establishing the disciples * * * and having passed through the upper country, came to Ephesus." We shall not here attempt to decide whether Ramsay or Lightfoot be correct about Paul's line of travel on this occasion, since even if one agree with Ramsay that it led through Colosse, it has no bearing on the opportunity of Onesimus to know Paul. It was simply a confirming tour, going over ground previously traveled, and did not become evangelistic till Ephesus was reached. There is neither proof nor probability that Paul stopped in the Lycus valley and no evidence whatever that he became acquainted with the Philemon-family until the great Ephesus meeting described in Acts 19. Therefore, Prof. Ramsay's contention, however well sustained, is irrelevant to the matter under consideration.

Tradition has something to say of the future of Onesimus:

1. A letter of Ignatius, about A.D. 107, mentions an Onesimus, pastor at Ephesus, and incidentally seems to allude

several times to matters in the letter to the Colossians, but there is nothing in this Ignatius letter to identify Onesimus, pastor at Ephesus, with Paul's Onesimus. The mere sameness of name proves nothing.

2. Traditions of both the Roman and Greek churches have much to say of Paul's Onesimus, giving him exalted positions, but the historical evidence underlying the traditions is without value, practically amounting to nothing.

After the foregoing discussion there is little more in the text of the letter to which attention needs to be called. However, we will look at the section, 8-21, of the letter which has ever excited the greatest admiration. This section discloses Paul's method of making his plea:

1. I might enjoin by apostolic authority, but do not.

2. I might appeal to what you owe me, even your very salvation, but do not.

3. I might have presumed to keep Onesimus to serve me in your stead, but do not.

4. For love's sake I beseech rather, being such a one as Paul, the aged, and a prisoner.

5. Onesimus is the spiritual child of my bonds, my very heart.

6. It may have been God's providence that you lost him for a season to have him forever.

7. Before, he was not helpful, though he is named Onesimus (meaning helpful); now he is helpful, justifying the name.

8. Before, he was a slave; now, he is a brother.

9. As you and I are "partners," what he is to me let him be to you—receive him as you would me.

10. What he owes you by reason of theft or loss of service when absent, I, Paul, give written bond to pay.

11. You have refreshed other hearts, refresh also the heart of Paul, the aged prisoner.

12. I am confident you will do more than I ask.

This plea reminds us of other historical petitions, such as, Judah's plea for Benjamin (Gen. 44:18-34), and Jeannie Dean's plea before England's queen for her sister Effie, as told by Sir Walter Scott in "The Heart of Midlothian."

On Lightfoot's contention that "Paul, the aged," in verse 9 should harmonize with Eph. 6:20 and be rendered, "Paul an ambassador," I would say that the form of the word is not the same as in Ephesians. The ambassador-feature has already been given in verse 8. The context demands the usual meaning of the word, "aged."

J. M. Pendleton illustrates, by verses 18 and 19, the doctrine of Christ as surety for the sinner, and the release of the obligation against the original debtor just as soon as the creditor charges the debt to the surety. In this way Old Testament saints could be forgiven before the surety actually paid the debt in expiation.

QUESTIONS

1. To whom was this letter addressed?
2. What the probable relations of these parties to each other?
3. To whom was this letter principally addressed, and why were the others included?
4. What the relation of Paul to Philemon prior to this letter?
5. What Paul's previous relation to Archippus?
6. Where did this family live?
7. What other letters were sent at the same time with this?
8. What the date?
9. What the characteristics of the letter to Philemon?
10. What then gives this brief personal letter about a private matter its immense importance, and justifies its incorporation into the inspired Bible?
11. What other Pauline passages which also disclose Christianity's attitude toward slavery; what their teaching, and what the greater importance of this letter?
12. How has this attitude been received?
13. What example in this country?
14. How was slavery imposed upon the colonies, and later upon the states of this union?
15. What was the state of mind of the best men in both free and slave sections toward the institution *per se?*
16. What the condition in Paul's day?
17. What one privilege remained to the slave?
18. What case in point?

19. What the pleas made in Pliny's letter?
20. Compare this with Paul's letter.
21. For what other purposes than illustration and comparison is this letter of Pliny introduced?
22. What the answers to these questions in order?
23. What has tradition to say of the future of Onesimus?
24. What part of the letter has ever excited the greatest admiration, and what the items of Paul's plea?
25. Of what other historical petitions does this remind us?
26. What says the author of Lightfoot's contention that "Paul the aged" in verse 9 should harmonize with Eph. 6:20 and be rendered, "Paul an ambassador?"
27. What great doctrine does J. M. Pendleton illustrate by verses 18, 19, and how?

Date Due

LIBRARY BUREAU FORM 1137

220.7

Carroll 102
Galatians, Romans, Philippians, Philemon.

DATE	ISSUED TO

220.7 102
GALATIANS, ROMANS, PHILIPPIANS,
PHILEMON

BS2650.3 .C236 Carroll, Benajah Harvey,
Galatians, Romans, Philippians
0 0000 00056259 0
Gardner-Webb University Library